Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-079
Monday
25 April 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-079 *25 April 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Chernavin Proposes Fewer Mediterranean Ships 1
'Mandate' Talks Agree to CSCE Framework 1
SS-20 Transports To Be Converted Into Cranes 1
INF Verification Preparations Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 17 Apr]* 2
Carlucci View of 'Stabilizing' SDI Refuted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Apr]* 2
Warsaw Pact Members Polled on INF, Parity 3

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Socialist Conference Information Report *[PRAVDA 17 Apr]* 5
Delegates Attend Asia Debate *[PRAVDA 18 Apr]* 6
CEMA-Latin American Relations Seminar Opens 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

'Politiologists' Primakov, Shishlin Interviewed 7
View 'Mistakes,' Security 7
On Relations, Arms Control 7
'International Observers Roundtable' *[Pasko, Pyadyshev, Chukseyev]* 8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Shultz Moscow Visit 13
Gorbachev on Reagan Statements 13
Shevardnadze Comments on Talks 14
'Entire Spectrum' Discussed 16
'Text' of USSR-U.S. Statement 16
Zorin Interviews Shultz 18
Shultz News Conference 22 Apr 20
Shultz News Conference at Ministry *[PRAVDA 23 Apr]* 21
Shevardnadze News Conference 22
Shevardnadze on Consultations 22
Comparison of News Conference 25
Shevardnadze Hosts Dinner 25
Shultz Tours Moscow Sights 25
Wrap-Up of Visit to Moscow 26
Leaves for Kiev 26
Arrives in Kiev 26
Kiev Reports Shultz Visit 26
Leaves for Tbilisi 27
Shultz Arrives in Tbilisi 28
Confers With Georgian Official 28
Interview With Biryukov 28
Tours Tbilisi, Departs 24 Apr 29
Departure From USSR 30
Karpov Describes 'Key' Meeting 30
Reagan Makes 'New Threats' Against Iran 31

China

Envoy Briefed on Shultz-Shevardnadze Talks 31
Philippines' Aquino Meets With Officials *[PRAVDA 17 Apr]* 32
Shakov Views Qian Qichen XINHUA Interview 32
YANGCHENG WANBAO Ponders Reform Tasks *[PRAVDA 15 Apr]* 32
PRC Promoting Trade With Socialist Countries 32
Economical, Political Benefits of Border Trade 33
Briefs 33
Publishing Links 33

Northeast Asia

Gromyko Meets Japan's Matsumae in Kremlin 33
Dobrynin Meets Japanese Communist Delegation 33
Soviets Deny Favoritism Toward JCP, JSP *[Tokyo KYODO]* 34
Japanese 'Defend-the-Constitution' Group Arrives 34
Parliamentary Group Delegation Leaves for Japan 34
Report Views Japan-U.S. Cocom Talks in Tokyo 34
Uno's Viewing of Northern Islands Denounced 35
DPRK's Kim Il-song Meets With Gen Lushev *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Apr]* 35
DPRK Delegation Stops Over En Route to Zambia 35

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Razumovskiy Leads Delegation to Vietnam 35
Seen Off by Demichev 35
Opens Talks in Hanoi 35
SRV, India See Afghan Pact as Cambodian Model *[Alekseyev]* 36
Shevardnadze Receives Departing Lao Ambassador 36
18 Apr Ceremony Noted *[PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 36

Near East & South Asia

PLO's 'Arafat Arrives in Syria 24 Apr 37
PLO Officials Cited on Coexistence, Uprising 37
'Ready for Peaceful Coexistence' 37
Envoy Condemns Israeli 'Terror' 38
Shevardnadze To Visit Mideast After Summit 38
No Plans To Include Israel *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 38
Will 'Center' on Gulf War *[Kuwait KUNA]* 38
Iranian Speedboats Attack Liberian Tanker 39
Vorontsov Receives Iranian Ambassador 39
U.S.-Israeli Memorandum, Shultz Plan Viewed *[Solton]* 39
Afghan Agreements Seen as Model for Mideast *[Geyvandov in IZVESTIYA 22 Apr]* 39
Misgivings Noted on U.S. Afghan Accords Stance *[Ponomarev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Apr]* 41
U.S. Group Meets Soviet Troops in Afghanistan 42
Fate of Soviet POW's in Afghanistan Deplored *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 20 Apr]* 42
Murakhovskiy Meets With Afghan Deputy Premier *[PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 43
Anniversary of Afghan Revolution Celebrated 44
Orlov Leads Delegation 44
Najibullah Cites Progress 44
'Unsuitable Methods' of Revolution 44
Najibullah Speech on Afghan Elections Cited 45
Afghan Provinces Prepare for Refugee Return 45
Syria, USSR Exchange Greeting on Anniversary 46
Syrian Premier Congratulated *[IZVESTIYA 17 Apr]* 46
Al-Asad Message 46
Admiral Sidorov Discusses PDRY Ties in Aden *[Aden ANA]* 46
Meets With Defense Minister *[Aden]* 46
Kuwaiti Social, Cultural Progress Analyzed *[Bovin in IZVESTIYA 19 Apr]* 47

East Europe

Vorotnikov Departs for SFRY Visit 47
Zaykov, PZPR's Glowczyk Mark Treaty Jubilee *[PRAVDA 21 Apr]* 48
Glowczyk Visits Lenin Tomb 48
Yakovlev Talks With Glowczyk *[PRAVDA 21 Apr]* 48
Ryzhkov's Hungarian Talks, Results Reported 48
Soviet, Polish Trade Union Leaders Meet *[Warsaw PAP]* 49
Ceausescu Greets Gorbachev During Overflight *[PRAVDA 22 Apr]* 49
CPCZ Presidium Approves Husak Moscow Talks *[IZVESTIYA 17 Apr]* 50
Soviet Cosmonaut To Direct Office in Berlin 50

West Europe

TV Interview With George Blake Reported 50
Gromyko Answers Finnish Delegation's Questions *[IZVESTIYA 23 Apr]* 52
Zubko Views Danish Action on Nuclear Port Calls *[IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]* 55
NATO 'Frantic' To Block Decision 55
Danish Campaign for Early Elections Assessed *[PRAVDA 21 Apr]* 56
Visit by French Defense Research Group Official *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Apr]* 57
Primakov Remarks on Roundtable With UK *[PRAVDA 17 Apr]* 57
U.S.-Greek Talks on Bases End Without Result 57

Latin America & Caribbean

Zafesov Views U.S. 'Big Stick' Panama Policy *[PRAVDA 21 Apr]* 57
Supreme Soviet Delegation on Caribbean Tour 58
Meets With Cuba's Aguirre *[IZVESTIYA 21 Apr]* 58
Talks With Guyanese President *[IZVESTIYA 22 Apr]* 59
Guyana Visit Summed Up 59
Arrives in Trinidad 59
Cubans Lauded on Resistance at Bay of Pigs *[Sidoruk in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 17 Apr]* 60

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Moscow Hosts Lenin Anniversary Celebration 61
Leadership Appearances 61
Razumovskiy Delivers Report *[PRAVDA 23 Apr]* 61
Public Celebrations Described 69
Zaykov Lays Wreath 69
Stalin's Undermining of Lenin's Ideas Recalled *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 21 Apr]* 70
Supreme Soviet Session Set for 24 May 72
RSFSR Supreme Soviet Continues Discussions 72
Discusses Economic Reform 73
Completes Session *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Apr]* 73
Journalists Union Discusses Restructuring *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Apr]* 74
Historians' Letter Supports Perestroyka 74
TV Program on Ministers' Opposition to Glasnost *[Sinitsyn]* 75
Armenians Gather in Moscow To Mark 'Genocide' *[AFP]* 77
Landslides Necessitate Kirghizia Evacuation 77

Economic

Aganbegyan Discusses Bureaucratic 'Props' *[Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO 20 Apr]* 77
Dolgikh, Slyunkov Speak on Modernizing Equipment *[PRAVDA 16 Apr]* 78
Decree Issued on Planning, Fulfillment of Tasks
[SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA ROSSISKOY SOVETSKOY FEDERATIVNOY SOTSIALISTICHESKOY RESPUBLIKI, No 5] 81
Official Views Development of Services Sphere *[IZVESTIYA 2 Apr]* 82

Agricultural

Media Report 19-23 Apr Agricultural Developments 83

Scientific

'Spetsatom' To Handle Nuclear Emergencies 84
Mars Probes To Be Launched 7, 12 July 84
Experiments Aboard 'Mir' Station Described 84
East-West To Cooperate in Atomic Energy 85
New Computer Based on 'YeS-1068' Completed 85
Briefs 85
Space Signal Received 85

Military

Lizichev Delivers Cultural Enlightenment Report *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Apr]* 85
Report Details Draftees' Shortcomings *[PRAVDA 17 Apr]* 86

Chernavin Proposes Fewer Mediterranean Ships

LD251407 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT 25 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—By TASS correspondents Vadim Biryukov and Gennadiy Talalayev:

"Both sides could set the limit of 15 combat ships and 10 escorts in order to achieve an agreement on freezing the number of Soviet and American vessels in the Mediterranean," Admiral of the Fleet Vladimir Chernavin, commander-in-chief of the Navy and deputy defence minister of the USSR, said today.

This step was possible provided the United States withdrew its multi-purpose aircraft-carriers and atomic submarines armed with ballistic missiles from that region, as the most destabilising systems, the Soviet military commander told the TASS correspondents.

"It is also important that the fleets of other countries, which are not Mediterranean nations, do not increase their contingents and do not perfect their infrastructure in the Mediterranean once that the USSR and the United States have reached the freeze agreement," he noted.

The admiral gave attention to the fact that the latest Soviet initiatives advanced by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Belgrade last March envisaged support for the elaboration by the Mediterranean and other countries concerned of ways and means to safeguard the safety of shipping, especially in international straits.

"The implementation of this proposal would play, in our view, a positive role in turning the Mediterranean Sea lanes into routes of peace, goodneighbourliness and cooperation," Chernavin said.

He noted that a large naval force of the North Atlantic Alliance was currently in the Mediterranean. The force includes about 550 warships and boats, including atomic submarines armed with ballistic and cruise missiles, and nuclear-armed multi-purpose aircraft-carriers.

Naval and tactical aircraft (up to 600) are also deployed in the region.

The U.S. 6th Fleet made up the backbone of the forces, the admiral observed. Its vessels carried about 1,000 nuclear warheads and up to 75 per cent of NATO's carrier-based strike aircraft in the Mediterranean.

The NATO naval force in the Mediterranean was largely superior to the Warsaw Treaty force, Chernavin pointed out. "Comparing the naval presence of the United States and the Soviet Union in the Mediterranean, one should stress that the presence of a limited number of Soviet ships in that region is a forced measure in response to the permanent presence of the U.S. 6th Fleet.

The United States has in that region 15-20 warships (a multi-purpose aircraft-carrier, a missile cruiser, 8-9 destroyers and frigates, 2-4 amphibious ships, including a helicopter carrier, and 4-5 atomic multi-purpose submarines) and 10 escort ships.

Besides, there are, as a rule, three submarines armed with ballistic missiles.

The USSR maintains 12-15 combat ships (a cruiser, 4-6 destroyers and anti-submarine ships, up to five submarines, some of which are diesel-powered, and no atomic submarines armed with ballistic missiles) and 10-12 escort ships.

Speaking about other possible measures to maintain peace in the Mediterranean, Chernavin said: "We suggest that the USSR and the United States, prior to agreeing upon common confidence-building measures in the spirit of the Stockholm accords, notify in time each other and all Mediterranean nations about major movements of naval forces which possess a sudden-attack potential, and about military exercises and invite observers to watch them."

'Mandate' Talks Agree to CSCE Framework

LD251031 Moscow TASS in English 1023 GMT 25 Apr 88

[Text] Vienna April 25 TASS—A regular meeting was held here today within the framework of consultations between representatives of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO member-states on the elaboration of a mandate for future talks on a reduction in the armed forces and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Yet another element of the mandate was agreed upon: to the effect that the talks would be conducted within the framework of the CSCE process between the 23 states which had participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and which are members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO. Thereby a new step was made towards the elaboration of mandate.

Understandings on the objectives of the talks, a preamble of a mandate, verification, an exchange of information, and on starting the talks in 1988 had been reached earlier.

SS-20 Transports To Be Converted Into Cranes

LD251249 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0745 GMT 25Apr 88

[Text] Odessa, 25 Apr (TASS)—The first transport vehicle from a medium-range missile, known in the West as an SS-20, has arrived at the Odessa Heavy Crane-Building Works in the south of the Ukraine. It has been

decided to produce mobile construction cranes with a great lifting capacity on the basis of such chassis after the INF Treaty between the USSR and the United States comes into force.

According to the treaty, the missile itself is to be scrapped and the equipment servicing it can be used for peaceful purposes. Preparations for such use of the transport chassis were begun at the works even before ratification of the Soviet-U.S. treaty.

Designers at the works have already developed the design for an 80-tonne crane that will be fitted on the former missile chassis. It will be shortened, by the way, to ensure that it would be impossible to use it in the future as part of a combat missile installation.

The Swiss-West German firm Liebherr also has offered to take part in the production of heavy cranes on the former chassis of missile installation chassis. Its president, Hans Liebherr, who visited Odessa recently in connection with the setting up of a joint enterprise, stated that the firm has available the design for a crane with a lifting capacity of 120 tonnes, which can be used with the former missile chassis with the minimum of design modification.

INF Verification Preparations Outlined

PM221427 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with Colonel V.S. Koltunov, USSR Defense Ministry spokesman, with own correspondent S. Guk under the rubric "USSR Defense Ministry on the Line": "Preparations for Inspections"; date and place of interview not given—first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] IZVESTIYA (Issue No 105), under the rubric "The Pentagon Is on the Line," published an interview with a U.S. Defense Department spokesman about U.S. preparations for inspections under the Treaty for the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Today the Soviet side has the floor. Our correspondent talks to USSR Defense Ministry spokesman Colonel Viktor Stefanovich Koltunov.

[Guk] A new department has been set up at the Pentagon—the Section for On-Site Inspections. Its staffers will visit our country and accompany Soviet inspectors arriving on inspection missions in the United States. It must be assumed that a similar subdivision has also been set up in our country.

[Koltunov] Naturally. Its functions are analogous, as already reported by IZVESTIYA, so I will avoid repetition.

[Guk] The two countries' inspectors will start reciprocal visits 30 days after the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has come into force. This is a new, not to say unusual, job. How is our team preparing itself for working with the American colleagues?

[Koltunov] All its members are currently undergoing thorough and multifaceted training. It is necessary to thoroughly rehearse the methods of carrying out on-site inspections and to be familiar with the U.S. missiles which are subject to elimination. The inspectors will have to carry out such functions as measuring the weight, size, and other parameters of the weapons. They will need to know English, and their conversational skills must be improved. As is known, the treaty provides for several types of inspection. Some will have to carry out inspections on a permanent basis at the "Hercules" plant in Magna City, Utah. Some will conduct one-shot inspections, while others will monitor the actual process of eliminating the Pershing and Cruise missiles.

[Guk] Is there a mechanism for dealing with potential conflict situations?

[Koltunov] Let's hope it will never come to that. However, the possibility of the emergence of controversial issues of one kind or another on which the sides cannot reach agreement right away cannot be ruled out either. Both we and the Americans have firm intentions: At first, an effort must be made to resolve problems on the spot. However, if this proves impossible, there is provision under the treaty for a Special Soviet-American Control Commission, one of whose tasks is to resolve all questions relating to the implementation of the treaty obligations.

[Guk] Could the current verification mechanism serve as a model for the future agreement on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive arms?

[Koltunov] Unquestionably. Naturally, the verification system will have to be substantially expanded and added to. Judge for yourself: not only land-based means but also SLBM's and cruise missiles, ALCM's, and strategic bombers will be subject to reduction. And since not all strategic offensive arms will be subject to elimination, verification will, naturally, be much more complicated. However, the experience which the USSR and the United States have acquired in the process of elaborating the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and the experience which both sides will gain in the course of its implementation will be exceptionally useful in elaborating the new mechanism, which will make it possible to ensure reliable and effective verification of the elimination of 50 percent of strategic arms too.

Carlucci View of 'Stabilizing' SDI Refuted

PM221515 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Apr 88 Second Edition p 3

[Reserve Colonel Candidate of Technical Sciences V. Chernyshev "International Notes": "'Justification....'"]

[Text] In an article published in the WALL STREET JOURNAL, U.S. Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci asserts that SDI "promises to have a stabilizing effect on the nuclear balance" and will make "more realistic the prospect of deep reductions in strategic armaments."

The constant reiteration of this thesis by U.S. Administration representatives is bewildering, to say the least. As a report in THE WASHINGTON POST recently made clear, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff are advising the administration to direct work on the SDI program toward the deployment of an ABM system for the defense of U.S. "vitally important military targets." When this recommendation was being worked out, the newspaper stressed, "slight attention was paid" to strategic and political aspects or to the impact that deploying such a system would have on the process of arms reduction and limitation. The prime consideration was how the ABM system would "ensure victory or at the very least prevent defeat in a nuclear war." Thus the "star warriors" efforts are not directed toward strengthening stability or securing an opportunity to escape from the nuclear "impasse."

In actual fact the deployment of SDI or even the threat of such a deployment would drastically upset the stability of the international situation. You do not need to be a specialist in the field of military strategy to understand that; simple common sense will do. If, given the existence of a nuclear balance between the two powers, one side adds a new element to the nuclear equation, can there be any talk of maintaining equilibrium? Clearly not: the equilibrium disappears. Furthermore, matters are complicated by the fact that the effectiveness of the new element—an extensive ABM system—is unknown not only to the opposing side but even to the side deploying such a system, because its effectiveness can only be tested against a real nuclear missile strike. Consequently, the opposing side has to plan for the worst eventuality and in the light of those plans build up and improve its strategic offensive forces so as to compensate for the existence of the ABM system and restore the stategic equilibrium. Can this make the prospect of deep strategic arms reductions any more realistic? In my view such expectations fly in the face of elementary logic.

There is a close interconnection between strategic offensive and defensive armaments: Effective measures to limit ABM systems are a substantial factor in curbing the strategic offensive arms race and are designed to reduce the danger of a war using nuclear weapons. To flout or ignore that interconnection inevitably has the opposite effect. It is also important to bear in mind that this interconnection is permanent and universal in character, it is not "erased" or made to disappear by the appearance of the possibility of creating technically more sophisticated and effective ABM systems. Hence it follows that at any time and under any circumstances the refusal to take account of the interconnection between offensive and defensive systems must inevitably upset stability.

The Soviet assessment of the influence of SDI on strategic stability is shared throughout the world, including in the United States itself, by prominent politicians and social figures, military specialists, and scientists. The implementation of the SDI program, they state, will aggravate the international situation and lead to the dangerous destabilization of the situation in the world.

Attempts to "justify" SDI's positive role now, when broad opportunities have appeared for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and when the Soviet Union and the United States have taken the first joint step in that direction, are particularly unacceptable and work counter to the prospects of movement toward true strategic stability and common security for all the peoples.

Warsaw Pact Members Polled on INF, Parity

LD221932 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—The vast majority of people simultaneously polled in Moscow, Budapest, Warsaw and Prague believe that the scrapping of Soviet and U.S. intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles will mean greater security for the European nations.

The public opinion survey has covered 500 persons in each capital.

Most of them said they follow international developments all the time. The progress of the Washington summit, for instance, was closely monitored by 84 percent of the Muscovites, 53 percent of the respondents in Budapest, 59 percent of those in Warsaw and 49 percent in Prague.

"A total of 34 percent of the Muscovites, 42 percent of the residents of Budapest and Prague and 33 percent of those in Warsaw take the view that there is a rough parity of forces between the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic bloc," TASS was told by Yeleva Bashkirova of the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute of Sociological Studies.

"Some 40 percent of the people in Moscow and Warsaw believe that NATO is militarily superior to the Warsaw Treaty, while two in ten people in Warsaw and Prague believe that the Warsaw Treaty members are the stronger." [sentence as received]

Despite differing views on the present situation, between 60 and 80 percent of those polled believe that there

should necessarily be a balance between the armed forces

of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO. Asked about the probability of an armed conflict in Europe, 66 and 69 percent of the respondents respectively in Warsaw and Budapest said it is low or non-existent, a view shared in Moscow by merely 29 and in Prague by 36 percent of those polled.

Socialist Conference Information Report
PM221045 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Apr 88
Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed "Information Report on the Results of Discussions on the Work of the International Journal PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA"]

[Text] A discussion of the work of the fraternal parties' journal PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA [PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM] was held in Prague 12-15 April 1988. Taking part in the meeting were delegations from the following 93 communist, workers, and revolutionary-democratic parties: the Socialist Party of Australia, the Communist Party of Austria, Algeria's Socialist Vanguard Party, the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-Labor Party (Angola), the Communist Party of Argentina, the PDPA [People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan], the Communist Party of Bangladesh, the Bahrain National Liberation Front, the Belgian Communist Party, the Revolutionary Party of the People of Benin, the BCP, the Communist Party of Bolivia, the Brazilian Communist Party, the Communist Party of Great Britain, the MSZMP, the Communist Party of Venezuela, the Communist Party of Vietnam, the United Party of Haitian Communists, the People's Progressive Party of Guyana, the Communist Party of Guadeloupe, the Guatemalan Party of Labor, the African Party for Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde, the SED, the German Communist Party, the Communist Party of Honduras, the Communist Party of Greece, the Communist Party of Denmark, the Dominican Communist Party, the Egyptian Communist Party, the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin, the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front, the Communist Party of Israel, the Communist Party of India, the Indonesian Communist Party, the Communist Party of Jordan, the Iraqi Communist Party, Iran's Tudeh Party, the Communist Party of Ireland, the Spanish Communist Party, the Yemeni Socialist Party, the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party, the Communist Party of Canada, the Restorative Party of the Working People of Cyprus—AKEL, the Communist Party of Colombia, the Congolese Party of Labor, the Korean Workers Party, the Popular Vanguard Party of Costa Rica, the Communist Party of Cuba, the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, the Communist Party of Lesotho, the Lebanese Communist Party, the Communist Party of Luxembourg, the Congress Party for Malagasy Independence, the Communist Party of Malta, the Moroccan Party of Progress and Socialism, the Socialist Party of Mexico, the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique Party, the MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party], the Nepal Communist Party, the New Zealand Socialist Unity Party, the Norwegian Communist Party, the Palestine Communist Party, the People's Party of Panama, the Paraguayan Communist Party, the Peruvian Communist Party, the PZPR, the Portuguese Communist Party, the RCP, the Communist Party of El Salvador, the Communist Party of Saudi Arabia, the Independence and Labor Party of Senegal, the Syrian Communist Party, the CPSU, the Sudanese Communist Party, the Communist Party of the United States, the Tunisian Communist Party, the Communist Party of Turkey, the Communist Party of Uruguay, the Communist Party of the Philippines, the Finnish Communist Party, the French Communist Party, the CPCZ, the Communist Party of Chile, the Swiss Labor Party, Sweden's Left Party Communists, the Communist Party of Ecuador, the Workers' Party of Ethiopia, the South African Communist Party, the South Korean National Democratic Front, the Workers' Party of Jamaica, the Japanese Communist Party, and two further parties whose names are not mentioned at their request.

A report by the Editorial Collegium and the Editorial Council on the journal's work between December 1984 and February 1988 was submitted for discussion.

The participants in the discussion, having critically and comprehensively analyzed the activity of their collective publication and having noted its great importance during the 30 years of its existence, submitted specific proposals aimed at the renewal and restructuring of the journal PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA in line with the new conditions and demands and also with the greater requirements of ideological-theoretical work and the need to exchange opinions and information between fraternal parties struggling for peace, democracy, national liberation, independence, and social progress. It was said that the journal must accomplish a decisive turnaround in the direction of new realities and problems in a spirit of Marxist approach toward the most topical problems of social development taking into account specific conditions in individual countries and regions. Particular attention was given to the coverage of questions concerning the prevention of nuclear catastrophe, disarmament and primarily nuclear disarmament, the correlation of the struggle for peace with the struggle for national and social liberation and socioeconomic development, and to the questions of dialogue and cooperation between communists and all peace-loving and democratic forces. Many participants in the conference noted the importance of the new political thinking in our time.

Emphasis was placed on the need to raise both the theoretical and informative standards of the publication and to improve the form in which material is presented so as to increase the readership's interest in the journal.

The participants in the conference suggested to the Editorial Council that it take measures to deepen the democratization of the editorial organization's structure on the basis of collegiality, equality, and respect for each party's opinions and views, in a spirit of noninterference in their internal affairs and internationalist cooperation.

The discussion proceeded in an open and comradely atmosphere.

Delegates Attend Asia Debate

PM221015 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Exchange Of Opinions"]

[Text] Prague, 17 Apr—There was a roundtable meeting in Prague on 16-17 April of a number of representatives of communist and workers parties of the Asian-Pacific region who attended the conference to discuss the work of the journal PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA [PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM].

The meeting participants exchanged opinions on the complex processes taking place in that part of the world and noted positive trends. There was mention of the need to widen cooperation among the broadest progressive and peace-loving forces in the interests of delivering the region's countries from the nuclear threat and of creating favorable international conditions for the solution of the vital social problems of the Asian-Pacific region's countries. The roundtable meeting participants exchanged information on their constructive steps to improve the situation in that extensive region.

I.I. Kovalenko, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, and G.S. Ostroumov, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committe department, represented the CPSU.

CEMA-Latin American Relations Seminar Opens

LD211309 Moscow TASS in English 1105 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Caracas April 21 TASS—TASS correspondent B. Shcherbakov reports:

A seminar on the development of trade and economic cooperation between member states of the Latin American Economic System (LAES) and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) started its work here. It is held in line with the cooperation programme for 1987-1988 which was signed between the CMEA and the LAES in May 1987 and which provides for a joint analysis of relations between them with a view to determining specific prospects for their development, the most effective areas and forms of cooperation.

Opening the seminar, Henry Gil, LAES deputy permanent secretary, noted that the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as CMEA member countries, possessed huge potentialities for the development of all-round business relations. The process of perestroyka, under way in the USSR and other socialist countries, opens prospects for developing new and more progressive forms of cooperation, pointed out Henry Gil. This fully conforms to the interests of countries forming the LAES, which seek to find reliable partners.

Marin Marinov, CMEA deputy secretary, pointed out in his speech that the seminar was being held at a time of a noticeable relaxation of the international situation. He gave a high appraisal of the Treaty on Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed between the USSR and the USA. Mankind sees in this only the first step on the way towards complete prohibition of the mass destruction weapons and to a removal of the threat of a nuclear war, noted Marin Marinov.

'Politiologists' Primakov, Shishlin Interviewed

View 'Mistakes,' Security

LD222227 Moscow World Service in English 0310 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Studio program hosted by unidentified announcer featuring "politiologists" Nikolay Shishlin and Yevgeniy Primakov—live or recorded; Shishlin and Primakov remarks in Russian fading into English report]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Our guest speakers today are two leading Soviet politiologists, Yevgeniy Primakov and Nikolay Shishlin. They are going to look back on the full-scale meeting of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee of 3 years ago, when the Communist Party pointed to the need for the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society. The Central Committee's meeting in April 1985 formulated the concept of new political thinking and new approaches to crucial domestic and international problems. Yevgeniy Primakov about new elements in Soviet foreign policy:

[Primakov] The balance of new ideas and positions in our foreign policy has been discussed for years. To notice what is new, one has to determine the element of tradition first. What I have in mind is that the principles of Soviet foreign policy formulated by Vladimir Lenin have never changed.

[Announcer] And what are these principles?

[Primakov] Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, solidarity with peoples fighting for liberation. There are many others. But sadly there was a time when some of Lenin's principles were ignored or violated. Now we are restoring them. And here is an example: When Lenin presented the decree on peace to the First Congress of the Soviets after the revolution, he said that that appeal to peoples and governments was not an ultimatum and should never be interpreted in that way. The side must be listened to and all other feasible counterproposals for peace taken into account. In other words, Lenin was against dictating and grandstand diplomacy and for the highest degree of realism in world affairs.

[Announcer] So as we look back we have to reconsider such things.

[Primakov] That's true, we made mistakes. We must now admit that we did, and we have been doing so openly. Take our attitude to Yugoslavia in the late forties and early fifties. It was a mistake. Although that attitude was reconsidered as early as 1955, significant political results were achieved just recently. Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Yugoslavia is evidence of this. I'm also certain that the Communist International made a serious mistake when in the thirties it branded the social-democratic parties chief enemies of the working class. Sadly, it was prompted to do this by the Soviet Union, and at a time when the Nazis were rising to power. Now we have a totally different attitude to the social democrats. We seek to find areas of agreement and not differences. Delegates from a number of socialist and social-democratic parties not so very long ago—that is last November—took part in an exchange of views in Moscow on the current world situation.

[Announcer] And now a question to Nikolay Shishlin: What is new about the USSR's current attitude to the question of security?

[Shishlin] We no longer see security as the security of the USSR and its allies. We are aware that there won't be a lasting peace without a comprehensive system of international security. Unilateral advantages are impossible. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] At this point, a few words must be said about the problem of sufficiency.

[Shishlin] I believe that the doctrine of reasonable sufficiency, although the need for it is clear, is still to be specified. The point at issue is a new military policy. Many outdated rules are going to be abandoned, for instance, that of a tit-for-tat reaction to military preparations made by the other side and the desire to gain military supremacy. If you can destroy the enemy once or twice, there's no need to have a potential capable of doing this 10 times. In any case, the principle of reasonable sufficiency has become a political category, and it can restore confidence between countries until just recently divided by an immovable hurdle. However, reciprocity is required in this matter. The principle of reasonable sufficiency and an exclusively defensive doctrine are not very simple to achieve. But the main direction has been determined, and we should move together along the path.

On Relations, Arms Control

LD231650 Moscow World Service in English 0310 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Studio program hosted by unidentified announcer featuring "politiologists" Nikolay Shishlin and Yevgeniy Primakov—live or recorded; Shishlin and Primakov remarks in Russian fading into English report]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Our guests in the studio at this time are two leading Soviet politiologists, Yevgeniy Primakov and Nikolay Shishlin. Their talk with our reporter—the first part of which you may have heard yesterday—is about the third anniversary of the April 1985 full-scale meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee. The need was stressed at it for bringing about Soviet society's revolutionary renewal. It can be stated with confidence that the concept of a new political thinking and new approaches to the solution of major domestic and international problems also originated at that meeting. Yevgeniy Primkaov and Nikolay Shishlin will reply to our reporter's question about the

practical implementation of the ideas of the April meeting. If yesterday the spotlight was on the philosophical aspect of international relations, today I'd like to discuss how effective the new thinking has proved to be for world politics. [passage omitted]

Nikolay Shishlin has this to say:

[Shishlin] In fact, what we've accomplished is a breakthrough in the new state of the world. For the past 3 years, a long political road has been covered. Our relations with the socialist countries have changed. They have acquired new facets, have become richer, not to mention a streamlined Soviet-Sino relations [as heard], which in itself is definitely the outcome of new political thinking. A new qualitative change has occurred in Soviet-Indian relations. In general, we've changed our attitude to problems of the developing countries. Earlier we used to say that the responsibility for the disastrous position of the developing countries rests with the capitalist powers engaged in plundering their economies. This was a correct formula, but it made us turn our backs on the problems of the developing countries. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] Yevgeniy Primakov elaborates:

[Primakov] In this context I'd like to draw your attention to several more aspects. World public opinion has also changed. It has changed because we have begun treating it differently. Earlier we proceeded from a premise that the policy of the capitalist countries was determined by certain groups of monopoly capital who look after only their own interests. Today, we admit that world public opinion plays an important role in working out political solutions. That is why we take it into account while working out our policy line.

[Announcer] Can you give us an example?

[Primakov] Let's take the question of arms control. Our previous formula was: with the help of national means. And these means are really effective. Using their national means, the Americans could detect even the smallest underground explosions carried out at our nuclear range in Kazakhstan. But the public raised the question that went: Why do we object to on-site inspections? Maybe we don't want any disarmament. In these conditions, Mikhail Gorbachev turned to his experts in Geneva and asked: Maybe we are wrong somewhere. Do we need verification less than the other side? I think we don't. So let's clearly take public opinion into account. Indeed, when the Soviet Union deciared that it was ready for all forms of controls, including on-site inspection, in case an agreement is reached on them, it won over world public opinion to its side. Now all questions should be turned to the United States. Such are the results of new approachesv. [passage omitted]

[Shishlin] The closest result of the new thinking will be—in my opinion—a further intensification of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, no matter who is going to win the forthcoming elections in the United States. Soviet-U.S. relations have already acquired such a force that nothing can stop the dialogue between the two countries. And where there is a dialogue, there are practical results as well. And the central topic of this dialogue will be, as before, a radical improvement of the international situation.

'International Observers Roundtable'

LD241954 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 24 Apr 88

["International Observers Roundtable" program, presented by All-Union Radio commentator Vladimir Georgiyevich Pasko, with Boris Dmitriyevich Pyadyshev, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium and editor in chief of MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, and Vitaliy Yakovlevich Chukseyev, TASS chief foreign news editor]

[Text] [Pasko] Hello, comrades. Quite a lot has happened in the past week. But I want to begin with a date: the third anniversary, which fell yesterday, of the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. That plenum laid the foundation of the restructuring of the whole of our internal life, and marked the beginning of the new political thinking that determines our actions in the international arena. We define the new political thinking as a correct understanding of new realities as analyzed by the method of materialistic dialectics. It differs from our previous thinking in that it places the traditional ideals of our foreign policy—peace, disarmament, cooperation, democratism, and equality—in the context of contemporary realities.

The strengthening of security, arms reduction, and the creation of international stability and trust have always been the main content of our policy. But every period dictates its own possibilities. The sixties and seventies saw the signing of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the three environments; the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; two agreements on strategic offensive arms limitation, and the ABM Treaty. Without those accords, the current world situation would undoubtedly have presented a different picture, and there would have been little possibility of tackling the tasks that we are today trying to resolve.

[Pyadyshev] Yet it should be said, nonetheless, that when 3 years ago the new leadership headed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev took over the running of the affairs of the party and state, the situation in the sphere of Soviet foreign policy was far from straightforward. Our course in foreign affairs was burdened with serious problems. Above all, as we remember, there was Afghanistan; and at that time, the situation surrounding Afghanistan was not such as to hold out any hope of an early settlement. There was no light at the end of the tunnel. The boundaries of foreign policy were unduly

extended. The Soviet Union was embroiled in a whole series of regional conflicts. Relations with the United States were very difficult. The talks—productive talks—on disarmament, including the central areas of reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms, were revolving on the spot without moving forward. The complexities of specific situations were obscuring the general reference points of Soviet foreign policy. As a result, certain fundamental processes that are taking place in international life—not peripheral, but fundamental processes—somehow escaped our attention. One example is that in these last few years, a number of countries in the Asian and Pacific region, known as the new industrial countries, have emerged in the forefront of world economic and political life and now dictate the fashion in world economic life: Hong Kong, Singapore, Indonesia, Taiwan, and South Korea. Yet what do we know about them? Really very, very little. These are processes that we have overlooked.

Now, since the April plenum of 1985, the party and the new Soviet leadership have been confronted by a very difficult task: first, to formulate a new concept of foreign policy, and second, to develop a program of specific and practical measures for putting it into practice. I will not speak specifically now about the first and second. I'll merely say that both the general concept of foreign policy and the practical measures are guided by, and based upon, one main consideration: a correct understanding of the national interest of the Soviet people and a correct understanding of the national interest of the Soviet state.

It may seem paradoxical that our leaders should speak of foreign policy in these terms, but they do employ the expression: Foreign policy must pay. Yes, our foreign policy must be profitable. It must take account of how any foreign policy move that we make is going to affect our domestic affairs. To put it crudely, how will any step we take in foreign policy affect the state of affairs in our non-Chenozem Zone? Will it not deflect further resources from the development of any one of our republics or oblasts? In short, the present foreign policy of the Soviet Union primarily serves—in addition, of course, to the task of strengthening the security of our homeland—the interests of our economic development.

[Chukseyev] I'd like to continue your train of thought, Boris Dmitriyevich, by drawing our listeners' attention to the fact that, in spite of all the world's contradictions, our time has opened new possibilities for providing international stability. The main factor here is undoubtedly the growing realization that the creation of security presents itself more and more as a political and universal task. It is impossible to strengthen one's own security without taking into account the interests of others. I'd like to quote something that was said at the 27th party congress: The highest wisdom does not consist in being exclusively concerned with oneself, least of all if it be to the detriment of another country. Rather, all must feel that they are equally secure, since the terrors and anxieties of the nuclear age engender unpredictability in politics and in specific actions.

The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed in December is without doubt a result and a vivid manifestation of the new political thinking. Last week, a preparatory commission of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, after comprehensive examination, recommended that the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium pass an affirmative decision on the question of ratifying that treaty. In the U.S. Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee voted overwhelmingly for ratification.

[Pasko] The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is today being described as a breakthrough in nuclear disarmament, and so it is. All we'd had previously was quantitative limitations on particular components of nuclear forces. Never before has there been an agreement eliminating a whole class of weapons. But I think what everyone is now interested in is something else: Is it possible—and if so, in what timeframe—to put into effect the other Soviet-U.S. accord agreed on in Washington, namely, that concerning a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms with retention of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972 and nonwithdrawal from it for a specified period?

[Pyadyshev] In support of that, Vladimir Georgiyevich, I'd like to say that we can and must declare firmly and very definitely that the course toward restructuring in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union which dates from the April 1985 plenum is producing perfectly real and specific results. To bring about positive changes in a tense international situation is an exceedingly difficult matter; nevertheless, we can already point to concrete results of the policy of restructuring. We are talking about not just specific accords and concrete agreements, although these are already of the greatest significance in themselves. I want to draw attention to another aspect, which is the actual atmosphere in which our foreign policy course is being pursued.

A visit by the Soviet leader is no ceremonial outing. It is a businesslike working visit involving intensive talks which last many, many hours and in the course of which we seek out, in enormously strenuous discussions with the opposing side, the foreign policy solutions that form our objective. A session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee means that the leaders of the allied states are getting down to business and conducting lively discussions in which they have a strong interest. If the Committee of Foreign Ministers meets, as it did in the Bulgarian capital, Sofia, just recently, then that session will be a businesslike discussion of specific problems of the diplomatic and foreign policy areas of

the work of the states of the alliance. It is in this situation, this new atmosphere, that specific practical accords and agreements have now become possible.

The U.S. secretary of state, George Shultz, has just ended his latest visit to Moscow and his talks with Eduard Amrosiyevich Shevardnadze. The ground that those talks covered was reported at Friday's news conference of the heads of the two foreign political departments. All I want to say is that regular meetings between Comrade Shevardnadze and George Shultz have now become established practice. This is no longer an extraordinary event in Soviet-U.S. relations, though a meeting of the two ministers is an event of great importance. These are businesslike working negotiations at which possible version of future accords are weighed and thrashed out. This latest meeting was mainly devoted to exploring and estimating the possibilities of achieving a new treaty, on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms, at the meeting between Comrade Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, which is due to take place on 29 May.

[Pasko] In the joint statement issued yesterday, Comrade Shevardnadze and Secretary of State Shultz once again reaffirmed their firm undertaking to make an intensive effort to complete the drawing-up of that treaty and of all documents associated with it—and to do so, moreover, in the shortest possible time. The ministers also noted the progress achieved at the talks relating to the ABM Treaty, as examined at the Washington summit.

[Pyadyshev] This, of course, is a very complex issue. It is difficult to judge at present, even on the results of the meeting now that it is over, the probability of a new treaty. As far as the Soviet side is concerned—and Comrade Shevardnadze has emphasized this—we consider that the necessary conditions do now exist for signing that new treaty in Moscow in May or June. The U.S. side is also in favor of intensifying our efforts to draw up a new agreement, although—and this does not escape our notice—a pessimistic note is now becoming more frequent in statements from Washington.

Well, anyway, whether or not a new treaty will be signed at the forthcoming summit, the main thing now, both for Soviet diplomacy and for U.S. diplomacy, is to mobilize themselves and concentrate on doing their utmost: that our diplomats, both Soviet and American, should really put themselves out and go all the way in doing their duty to politics, to the public, and to the peoples of their countries. As far as I know, our diplomats, our delegations working in Geneva—well, and above all, our diplomats working at the USSR Foreign Ministry here in Moscow, in Smolensk Square—are doing the maximum possible and tackling the matter vigorously and creatively in order to move forward to the conclusion of a new agreement.

[Pasko] It is a feature of our present-day policy that it directs us toward achieving a concrete and tangible result. The bold change of direction after the April CPSU Central Committee plenum opened a real prospect of solving the Afghan problem. The whole world witnessed the tense diplomatic contest that took place around, and at, the Geneva talks themselves regarding a peaceful settlement of the situation in Afghanistan. More than once, the impression was that the talks were reaching a deadlock. Yet they were completed, and completely successfully.

Vitaliy Yakovlevich, you've been following all that's been happening, and is still happening, around this question, so I'd like to ask you to tell us about it all in more detail.

[Chukseyev] The latest and most striking result of restructuring as it extends to the sphere of our foreign policy has been the signing in Geneva of a number of accords aimed at a settlement in Afghanistan. Well, the attractiveness of the qualitatively new approach to solving complex international problems is already convincingly shown by the positive response to Geneva on the part of political and public figures and the press in various countries of the world. At the same time, some representatives of the United States at the highest level—I refer, above all, to President Reagan—are trying to impose a point of view according to which the Russians were forced to take this step, and similar pressure must be applied in other areas, too. That idea is not new, and in general, it boils down to the delusion that with Moscow, one can and must talk only from positions of strength.

[Pyadyshev] We regard the statements that have been made by the U.S. leadership on this subject as politicking. We understand, of course, that there is an election campaign going on in the United States, and that there are old ideological prejudices. But, as Comrade Gorbachev remarked when receiving Shultz the other day, there is also responsibility to the world. Soviet-U.S. relations are in need of radical restructuring, and it's time to get rid of the delusion that we are insisting on this out of weakness. You won't build a realistic policy on that.

[Chukseyev] Let me say, first of all, that the talks on an Afghan settlement were extremely difficult and protracted. They went on for about 6 years. It was the active position of the Soviet side—especially in the last months—that was constantly nudging the course of events toward the attainment of an accord. Therefore, in my view, the culmination of that process in Geneva should be accounted a major political success for the Soviet Union. Let us analyze a few of the provisions of the documents signed in Switzerland. They impose, for instance, an obligation on Pakistan to stop supporting the opposition groups, close their camps on its territory, prevent arms from being brought in, and refrain from attempts to overthrow the government in the other

country—in other words, the Government of Afghanistan. This is to be enforced by the efforts of UN observers stationed along the frontiers.

The Geneva agreements also guarantee that the United States will avoid intervention in Afghanistan. Here is what is stated in the declaration on international guarantees signed by the USSR foreign minister, Comrade Shevardnadze, and the U.S. secretary of state, George Shultz: The USSR and the United States undertake to refrain rigorously from interference and intervention in any form in the internal affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

[Pasko] Incidentally, at the talks with the U.S. secretary of state, the Soviet side has drawn special attention to the responsibility of all interested sides for strict observance of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan and for strict observance of their letter and spirit. It was emphasized that any action calculated to undermine those agreements would be fraught with grave and unpredictable consequences. The secretary of state also noted the importance of the agreements.

[Chukseyev] These accords that have been achieved open the second stage of the settlement in Afghanistan. From 15 May, the phased withdrawal of Soviet troops will begin. Half the troops will be withdrawn by 15 August of this year, and the withdrawal of all the troops will be effected over a 9-month period. It goes without saying that it's too early to say the Afghan knot has been untied: Much difficult work remains to be done. It will be necessary to seek and find a solution to many questions. They include the formation of a coalition government and getting all the opposition—especially the part of it that is within the country—to join in that process. Efforts are already being made in that direction. The policy of national reconciliation has been pursued in Afghanistan since January 1987 and enjoys wide support. About 3,700 national reconciliation commissions have been set up in the country, and they number among their members more than 4,000 people from the opposition groups.

How will that process develop in the future? Political forecasts are not a reliable thing, especially bearing in mind the extremely complex and intricate character of the situation in Afghanistan and the interweaving of the interests of many countries around it. The reflections on this subject of an American newspaper, THE NEW YORK TIMES, merit attention, in my view. The newspaper asks itself the question: To what extent are the hopes of the United States justified that—I quote—with the departure of Soviet soldiers the majority of Afghan servicemen will desert from the Army at once and the Kabul government will be overthrown by the resistance forces? Answering this, THE NEW YORK TIMES cites the point of view of Western diplomats who, on its admission, believe that the Americans are in for a surprise—and an unpleasant surprise, by all accounts. This is what the newspaper writes: The opinion is held in diplomatic circles that the Afghan Government has assured itself of adequate support in the towns; in addition, it can depend on the Army and the security forces. But this is not yet all, the article goes on: A struggle might begin within the ranks of the rebel movement itself, which is already divided now, and individual rebel leaders might enter into separate deals with Kabul, if only not to allow the success of their rivals. But that is a problem for the future, albeit for the very immediate future. In the meantime, the stream of reactions that I spoke about at the start contains, emphatically expressed, the idea that the Afghan accords could serve as a model for a new approach to solving other regional conflicts, too.

[Pyadyshev] The interests of many sides are tied up in the Afghan knot; it is a very complex affair. Primarily, these are the interests of the Afghan people themselves, concentrated in the policy of the Kabul government, the policy of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. This is, of course, a not inconsiderable force in present-day Afghanistan. The mujahidin movement also has not inconsiderable possibilities. According to U.S. assessments, there are approximately around 100,000 of them under arms; they control a significant proportion of the territory of Afghanistan. The interests of Pakistan, Iran, China, India, and Washington, which has taken on the obligations of a guarantor under the Geneva agreements, are tied up in the Afghan knot; and of course, the Soviet Union cannot stand aside in any way. But in any event, let us memorize 15 May this year, the date when a new start in the history of the Afghan question will begin. On 15 May, our boys will start leaving Afghan soil, and a new stage in the development of events will begin. It will be possible to begin drawing a line under the old stage, a line which will mark both the tragic character of this history, and the courage of our soldiers and their internationalist duty.

[Pasko] The world is undergoing a process of rapid changes. It consists of many tens of states, each of which has its own, fully legitimate interests. They—all of them without exception—are faced with a task of a fundamental nature: without closing their eyes to social, political, and ideological contradictions, to master the science and art of conducting themselves in the international arena with restraint and circumspectly and of living in a civilized manner—that is to say, in conditions of correct international intercourse and cooperation. This conclusion of the 27th CPSU Congress applies directly to those conflicts going on in the world now.

Last week was marked by a dangerous exacerbation of the situation in the Persian Gulf. At the meeting with Secretary of State Shultz, the Soviet side expressed serious concern at the U.S. armed operations against Iran.

[Chukseyev] What happened in the Persian Gulf at the beginning of last week gave rise to intense concern and alarm among many countries of the world. However, in

my opinion, this was not unexpected. The amassing by the United States of their naval might in that region led logically to a more and more explosive situation; and, at least according to Washington's explanations, it was the incident with the U.S. warship, the "Samuel Roberts," which hit a mine there on 14 April, that sparked things off in that regard. On Monday 18 April, the United States decided to teach Iran a lesson by destroying two of its oil platforms. Marines landed on one of them and blew it up. The other was turned into a shapeless heap of metal by artillery fire. A few hours later, Iranian warships approached the U.S. naval forces. However, Harpoon missiles fired from the air seriously damaged two Iranian frigates and sank four missile launches.

Several tens of people were killed or injured on the Iranian side. The Americans lost a Cobra helicopter and its crew of two. These were the most active U.S. military actions against Iran since last summer when Washington started building up its military presence in the Persian Gulf. Now the Pentagon is keeping a cruiser there, four modern destroyers, and seven frigates. Right at the very entrance to the Gulf is a group of aircraft carriers. At the moment there are in total about 30 warships patrolling there. The Iranian Navy, of course, cannot stand up to any comparison with a fist like this. It is not fortuitous that President Reagan—as U.S. journalists testify—was so sure of success that he went to bed before the attack was carried out.

What amazes one in this entire story, is the pointlessness of the U.S. actions, as well as the fact that mines are still being laid in the Gulf. Admittedly, people familiar with the customs of U.S. political life will be able to see some sense in their applying crude force several thousand kilometers from the U.S. coast.

What it all amounts to is that in the heat of the preelection campaign, the Republican administration is intensely trying to project the image of an uncompromising and resolute defender of U.S. interests. Be that as it may, the escalation of military actions has brought commercial shipping in the Gulf to a complete standstill. At this very time, authorities in various countries have recommended that ships should not enter the Strait of Hormuz.

These are the commercial consequences of the abuse of force, so to speak, which can probably be measured in dollars. However, it is much more difficult to size up the enormous harm this kind of actions can do in whipping up further the Iran-Iraq conflict.

[Pasko] In these conditions, the Soviet proposal to establish naval forces flying the UN flag to protect shipping in the Persian Gulf seems logical and natural. This idea, incidentally, is supported by the countries of the region. They see in it a way to reduce the foreign military presence in the Gulf and reduce the threat of a confrontation and a widening of the conflict. The United States, however, are trying to circumvent this proposal. As before, Washington is laying stress on force, thereby aggravating the dead-end situation. In the meantime, the modern world has undoubtedly become too small and fragile for wars and for a policy of force. A major thesis of the new political thinking is precisely that peace cannot be saved and preserved without breaking resolutely and irreversibly with the way of thinking and the sort of action that have been built over centuries on the idea of wars and armed conflicts being acceptable and permissible.

People are becoming more aware of this, although too slowly, it seems to me. Nevertheless, I think that after the April CPSU Central Committee plenum and those major changes that it has introduced into our life, the world appears in much softer shades, very differently from 3 years ago.

The time of our meeting is over. I thank you, Boris Dmitriyevich and you, Vitaliy Yakovlevich, for taking part in it, and you, esteemed listeners for your attention. All the best.

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Shultz Moscow Visit

Gorbachev on Reagan Statements

LD221812 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev received the Secretary of State of the United States George Shultz on April 22. The main theme of their conversation was the forthcoming fourth Soviet-American summit—what its content should be and what atmosphere is needed for its success.

When beginning the conversation Mikhail Gorbachev agreed with the secretary of state's remark that it is important to listen not only to what people say when they are visiting but also to what they say when they are at home. From this point of view we in the Soviet Union could not but pay attention to the recent public statements by the U.S. President, he said. We would not want to think that we have exaggerated when we positively assessed the development of Soviet-American relations in recent times. This evaluation, as it seemed to us, is based on the assumption that both sides have started approaching each other more realistically, have begun to climb out of the prison of stereotypes and shed attempts to impose their views proceeding from one's interests alone, Mikhail Gorbachev said.

But despite what was said and done only recently in Washington sermons are again being delivered to us and we are being instructed on how we should behave ourselves. Our foreign policy is being assessed only negatively while the policy of the U.S. Administration is assessed only positively, Mikhail Gorbachev said. Moreover, everything that has been achieved in Soviet-American relations is being ascribed to the policy of strength and "putting pressure on the Soviets". Incidentally, this "concept of strength" is being backed up also by demonstrations of strength in respect of Nicaragua, Panama and in the Persian Gulf.

In these statements we again see a refusal to put up with political realities and disregard for the interests of others, for the principle of the balance of interests, Mikhail Gorbachev went on.

The question arises: How can this be explained and what is happening? We understand that an election campaign is under way and there exist old ideological attachments. But after all there also exists responsibility to the world, he said.

For us it is a reality that any administration will defend its country's interests, Mikhail Gorbachev went on. But it appears that these interests should reflect the will of the people. We are attentively following the sentiments of the American public and note with satisfaction that both Soviet people and Americans sincerely welcome signs of change for the better in relations between our countries. It turns out that on looking into the future many people in America not only do not want confrontation to remain but even reject the word "rivalry". The majority is for friendly relations, Mikhail Gorbachev said.

So whose interests are mirrored by official statements counting on fundamental concessions by the USSR and actually justifying the arms race? And is it not here that we should look for the deceleration the signs of which we observe time and again in the ongoing talks, including those connected with President Reagan's visit to Moscow?

And will it really happen that the forthcoming visit by a U.S. President to the USSR after a 15-year interval and after as many as three meetings with the present Soviet leadership will be reduced to going again into the "political ABC"—to explanations about existing realities which it is dangerous to ignore.

Today, Mikhail Gorbachev went on, narrow pragmatism has become counter-productive. It fetters mentality, impedes a broad vision of the present-day world and realisation of the fact that mankind has no future without respect for the free choice of every people. Without this the solution of concrete problems will constantly wind up in dead alleys. Without this there will be no genuine interaction between such powers as the USSR and the United States. That is why we keep repeating that Soviet-American relations are in need of a drastic restructuring. It is time to get rid of delusions that we are insisting on this because of "weakness", that because the position of the present Soviet leadership supposedly is unstable it is interested in some foreign policy success and for this reason is "persuading" the Americans to agree to cooperation. A real policy cannot be based on such absurdities. One can only miss the chance given by time to solve problems of world importance.

In this context the subject of human rights was touched upon. "We should reach an understanding here at long last in terms of principles," Gorbachev said.

"Despite the fact that talks and other contacts on this topic have been lately acquiring a businesslike nature, the U.S. approach to it remains confrontational and geared to interference in our domestic affairs: We are confronted with demands, terms and grievances all the time.

"We have so far been showing restraint. But if we reciprocate—and we can do so over a very wide range of issues, the atmosphere in Soviet-American relations can become such as will make it no longer possible to solve any further issues.

"We should realize once and for all that the Soviet and American societies have different values, and should not attempt to foist our customs and our ideas of what is good and what is bad on each other.

"Each country has many problems of its own and let it take care of them in its own way. This does not rule out, but, on the contrary, presupposes, studies of each other, cultural and scientific exchanges, etc. Let people take a look themselves and form their own judgement on everything.

"We are not going to re-educate the United States and do not recognize that it has any right to re-educate us."

The conversation covered also regional problems, including those connected with the Iran-Iraq war.

A high opinion was expressed of Geneva accords on Afghanistan. "By how the USSR and the United States will act in the process of the Afghanistan settlement," Gorbachev said, "the whole world will judge the worth of Soviet-American relations as a factor for improvement in the international situation. It is very dangerous if either side succumbs to the temptation to act contrary to the principle that Afghanistan should be an independent, neutral, non-aligned nation."

The discussion covered the main issues that could come up at the forthcoming Moscow meeting of the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the U.S. President. It was noted that during the meetings of Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz and at the delegations' talks in Geneva a large amount of work has been handled. But problems remain.

"We still are for completing the possible documents by President Reagan's arrival in Moscow," Gorbachev said.

The interlocutors agreed that the two countries should not limit themselves to what has already been achieved in Washington. The fourth summit can and should produce tangible results.

The program for the U.S. President's visit to the USSR in late May and early June was adopted in the main.

In conclusion Gorbachev asked Shultz to tell the President that in Moscow it is hoped that the upcoming Soviet-American summit will be held in a spirit of mutual respect and on a realistic basis, mark another step forward and have concrete and weighty results. The U.S. President will find here a reception worthy of relations between two great peoples.

He meeting was attended by Eduard Shevardnadze, Anatoliy Dobrynin, Sergey Akhromeyev, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, Colin Powell, Rozanne Ridgway, Paul Nitze and Ambassadors Yuriy Dubinin and Jack Matlock.

Shevardnadze Comments on Talks

LD221750 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today described the Kremlin meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Shultz earlier in the day as having had fundamental significance to the further development of Soviet-American relations.

Speaking at a news conference here, Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, added: "Naturally enough, it was important also in terms of the substance of the U.S. President's upcoming visit to the USSR."

He continued: "As one speaks of progress in Soviet-American relations today, one should not forget that it has been achieved thanks to strict compliance with the principles of equality, equal security, consideration for the interests of either side, and readiness to look for, and find, mutually acceptable solutions.

"To claim that the agreements and understanding between the USSR and the United States have been a result of any unilateral efforts and of a 'positions-of-strength' policy is to demonstrate irresponsible and politicking where they are inadmissible."

"As recently as last March in Washington it appeared as though the USSR and the United States would not be able to find a common language on Afghanistan.

"Having signed Geneva accords a week ago and become the guarantors of an Afghanistan settlement, we have not only predetermined a new trend in the life of that country and the region, but have also facilitated a more confident headway in our relations," Shevardnadze said.

"We have been getting ever more convinced that the USSR and the United States can fruitfully cooperate and achieve much. The Soviet leadership is doing everything for the Moscow summit to become a landmark event continuing the line of Geneva, Reykjavik and Washington and affirming the triumph of the principles of new political thinking over power politics in international relations."

Shevardnadze noted that discussions on humanitarian issues and on legal and political guarantees for human right were becoming businesslike and concrete. "Dialectics here is such that there should be no interference in each other's affairs," the Soviet foreign minister said.

"During the exchange of opinions on all the regional conflicts," he went on to say, "it turned out that practically everywhere there is some common ground—broader in some places and narrower in others—of action by our two countries to create felicitous conditions for political solutions."

"We have not worked out any identical optics for viewing problems, but we have become more objective in our judgements, including those on each other's intentions," the Soviet foreign minister said.

"The center of gravity at the negotiations lay, of course, in the security area," he emphasized. "The pivotal issue there is work on an agreement for a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms in the context of abidance by the ABM Treaty."

"We have not yet identified the key to resolving the problems existing in thie area, but it has become clearer to us what kind of key that should be.

"Both sides have voiced new ideas and thoughts and specified and introduced new elements in their positions on individual issues.

"It can be said that groundwork has been laid now in Moscow for practical advances at talks on the key problems related to strategic offensive arms," the Soviet foreign minister said.

"Progress has been made in other areas as well. We have been disappointed, however, by some things, in particular the American side's position on exchanges of data on the correlation of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. The United States refuses to make such an exchange."

"It was pointed out at the talks in Moscow," the Soviet foreign minister said, "that in the field of bilateral relations we have been able substantially to broaden cooperation and sign new agreements."

"On the whole, we have a positive view of the results of the Moscow meeting of the foreign ministers. It has marked an important phase in preparations for the Soviet-American summit which is now not far off," Shevardnadze said.

"There is an understanding that another meeting of the foreign ministers will be held in May. This attests to the common desire intensely to carry on the talks and search for accords," he added.

Then the minister answered questions from reporters.

Concerning the reality of concluding the drafting of the treaty on strategic offensive arms prior to the Moscow summit, Eduard Shevardnadze said: "We are not losing heart. We hold there are still opportunities to complete this complex and most difficult work". It is doubtful that the draft treaty will be completed by the visit of the President of the United States, he went on. "But following the Washington meeting we have considerably advanced on the question of the reduction of strategic offensive arms in conditions of the observance of the ABM Treaty. Specifically, we have come to understanding with the U.S. side that the Washington arrangements on not withdrawing from the ABM Treaty will be formalised as a separate agreement".

"As to the Middle East problem, there might be different approaches, but there is a basis for debates. The main thing is that the United States, just as other countries, has admitted that the known resolutions of the United Nations Security Council on Middle East can serve as a legal basis for an international conference on the Middle East settlement".

The minister emphasized the Soviet Union's invariable support for the lawful rights of the Palestinian people. "I must emphasize with all responsibility," Eduard Shevardnadze said, "that the improvement of Soviet-American relations can in no measure influence the Soviet Union's position with regard to the Palestinian people's lawful demands".

Dwelling on the Iran-Iraq conflict, Eduard Shevardnadze noted that there exist already certain prospects for pooling the efforts of the USSR. The USA and other states in the quest for the solution to this most complex problem of the present. Certain groundwork has already been laid—the resolution of the Security Council adopted on the basis of unity of all the members of the United Nations Security Council.

Answering the question as to how the United States role as a guarantor of the observance of the Geneva agreement on Afghanistan goes together with Washington's intention to continue supplying arms to the so-called "freedom fighters", the minister said: "We still hope that the United States will keep from this action for if the arms supplies are continued, this will complicate the situation regarding Afghanistan."

The Afghan settlement shows that the United Nations can help overcome most complex conflict situations of the present. The experience obtained can be used for solving other regional conflicts.

Answering the question about the United States most serious violations in the area of human rights, Eduard Shevardnadze said that such violations form a considerable list. "For instance, we remind to U.S. representatives at almost every meeting of the criminals Brazinskas who hijacked a Soviet airliner in 1970 and killed an air-hostess Nadezhda Kurchenko. They found shelter in the United States. Deplorably, the U.S. representatives do not react to our requests in a due way. One could also mention death penalty with regard to underage criminals in the USA, prosecution of participants in the anti-war movement, Washington's numerous denials of visas to Soviet trade union leaders and many other things. [no closing quotation mark as received]

One of the journalists asked what an effect the non-ratification of the treaty on intermediate-ra ıge and shorter-range missiles by the Moscow summit can have on its atmosphere. "The U.S. secretary of state, during the meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev and at the talks with me said he had no doubt about the ratification of the treaty", Eduard Shevardnadze said. "There is no doubt that if the treaty is not ratified this will have an adverse effect on the atmosphere of the meeting of the leaders of the two countries, will hamper the implementation of the aims and tasks set."

Touching upon the most promising areas of the Soviet-American cooperation, the minister said that the area of security is the main thing. "We have succeeded in the signing of the agreement on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and this is really a historic breakthrough. Work is now udner way, though slowly, tp prepare the draft agreement on 50 percent cuts in strategic offensive arms. There are good prospects for the drafting of a convention on banning chemical arms. There are interesting prospects also in the development of bilateral relations on the principles of mutual advantage and equality," Eduard Shevardnadze said in conclusion.

'Entire Spectrum' Discussed

LD221616 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 22 Apr 88

["Urgent—Soviet-American Talks Concluded"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz continued their talks here today.

The sides thoroughly analysed issues relating to the search for ways of resolving fairly regional conflict situations in various parts of the world. The need was stressed to continue and deepen the sides' cooperation with a view to eliminating dangerous seats of international tension.

The Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state stressed the principled importance of the signing of the Geneva agreements on the settlement of the situation relating to Afghanistan, of which the Soviet Union and the United States acted as international guarantors.

Shevardnadze gave special attention to the responsibility of all sides concerned for the successful implementation of the agreements, for their strict observance both in letter and spirit. Any actions directed at undermining these historic agreements and the process of national reconciliation gaining strength in Afghanistan would be fraught with grave and unpredictable consequences.

The U.S. secretary of state, for his part, stressed the importance of the Geneva accords—both in the context of diminishing regional tension and from the viewpoint of advancement of Soviet-American dialogue. He set out the U.S. Administration's approach to questions connected with their practical implementation.

In analysing the situation in the Persian Gulf area, the Soviet side expressed serious concern over the recent U.S. military actions against Iran, which hindered the peaceful settlement of the Iran-Iraq conflict, hampered the coordinated efforts of the U.N. secretary-general and the Security Council and could lead on the whole to an uncontrollable escalation of tension in that part of the world.

A business-like and frank exchange of views was held on questions related to the situation in Central America, in southern Africa, in the Horn of Africa, Kampuchea, the Korean peninsula and Cyprus.

Shevardnadze and Shultz discussed in broad terms issues of bilateral relations between the USSR and the United States. They noted, in particular, that concluding a number of agreements in specific areas, in which talks were currently conducted, would serve the interests of both sides.

Shevardnadze and Shultz heard reports by the heads of groups of experts on the results of their work and issued additional instructions to their delegations at the corresponding bilateral and multilateral talks.

Both sides expressed the conviction that the intensive discussions on the entire spectrum of Soviet-American relations would promote the fruitful and resultative preparations for the forthcoming summit in Moscow.

The following officials took part in the talks today: from the Soviet side—Deputy Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh, Soviet Ambassador to the USA Yu.V. Dubinin and member of the Collegium of the USSR Foreign Ministry V.P. Karpov, from the American side—Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Colin Powell, Assistant Secretary of State Rozanne Ridgway and U.S. Ambassador to the USSR Jack Matlock.

'Text' of USSR-U.S. Statement

LD221735 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Follows the text of the joint Soviet-American statement:

A meeting between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze and the Secretary of State of the United States George Shultz was held in Moscow on April 21-22 with the aim of further developing the Soviet-American dialogue and preparing for the meeting between the General Secretary of the

CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and the President of the United States Ronald Reagan, which is to be held in Moscow from May 29 to June 2, 1988.

The Secretary of State of the United States George Shultz and the Assistant to the U.S. President for National Security Affairs Colin Powell, who accompanied him, were received by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

All aspects of relations between the two countries were discussed in the course of the talks which were of a businesslike and constructive nature.

The sides agreed that the summit meeting in Moscow, the fourth such meeting in the past three years between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States, should become a new important stage on the road to more stable and fruitful mutual relations. Concrete possibilities of further advance in all spheres of mutual relations by the time of the summit were brought forth. The ministers reached agreement on the main events connected with the holding of the forthcoming summit in Moscow, including also the program of the visit. The ministers will supervise the work to prepare the Moscow meeting.

Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz agreed to hold their next meeting in May.

The meeting of the ministers began with a concrete and thorough discussion of human rights and humanitarian issues. The sides agreed with the need to continue and expand the dialogue at all levels with the aim of achieving concrete progress.

The importance of the speediest and balanced conclusion of the CSCE Vienna meeting, including the successful completion of talks on the working out of a mandate for future talks on armed forces and conventional armaments, was noted.

The minister of foreign affairs of the USSR and the secretary of state of the United States and also the leading experts of both sides discussed in detail a wide range of questions concerning arms limitation and reduction with a view to giving an additional impulse to the ongoing movement that was achieved lately.

The sides noted the progress achieved in this field and reiterated their firm commitment to make an intensive effort to complete the drafting of the treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms and all related documents within the shortest time possible. They discussed the results of the work done to date to prepare the text of the treaty, the protocol on inspections, the protocol on the conversion or elimination of strategic offensive arms and the memorandum of understanding.

The sides discussed the remaining differences on such questions as verification and count of long-range air-based cruise missiles, limitation and verification of long-range sea-based cruise missiles fitted with nuclear warheads, sublevels and mobile ICBM's. The delegations of the USSR and the United States will give priority to studying these questions as well as the already mentioned documents on verificaiton.

The ministers also noted the progress achie ed at the talks related to the ABM Treaty as it was stu ed at the summit meeting in Washington. There was a detailed discussion of the preparation of the joint draft text of a separate agreement on the basis of the formula contained in the joint statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and the President of the United States Ronald Reagan of December 10, 1987. Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz instructed the Soviet and American delegations at the Geneva talks to work out this joint draft text for its consideration at the next ministerial meeting.

Having discussed the range of questions related to bilateral full-scale stage-by-stage talks on problems of nuclear tests the ministers approved the text of the agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, initialled by their representatives at the Geneva talks, on the holding of the joint verification experiment. They instructed their delegations at the talks to complete as speedily as possible the work on the supplement to the agreement so that the agreement together with the supplement could be signed within the shortest possible period of time.

The ministers also approved a rough schedule of preparations for and the holding of the joint verification experiment at the testing site in Nevada and the testing site in Semipalatinsk.

In respect of the 1976 Treaty on Peaceful Nuclear Explosions the ministers instructed their delegations to prepare an appropriate protocol to this treaty for signing at the Moscow summit.

The ministers studied the state of affairs at the bilateral and multilateral talks in Geneva aiming for a comprehensive prohibition of chemical weapons amenable to effective verification and applying to all states capable of having chemical weapons. They instructed their delegations to conduct further constructive work, including in such fields as confidence-building, openness, verification and security of participating countries with the aim of facilitating the working out a multilateral convention banning chemical weapons. The ministers also noted their concern in connection with the growing problem of the proliferation and use of chemical weapons.

The sides conducted an extensive exchange of views on regional questions, including Afghanistan, the process of establishing peace in the Middle East, the Iran-Iraq conflict, the situation in Kampuchea, in the south of Africa, in Central America and also in the Korean peninsula.

Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz studied the results of the annual consultations on questions of bilateral Soviet-American relations held in Moscow this April 19-20. They discussed both new and traditional directions of bilateral cooperation with a view to achieving concrete results.

(Translated from the Russian) [TASS editorial notation]

Zorin Interviews Shultz

LD222231 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1937 GMT 22 Apr 88

["Special program": studio interview with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz for Soviet television by political observer Valentin Zorin; date not given—recorded; Shultz answers in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, Comrades. I want to introduce to you Mr George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, who is in Moscow now. Rather, this is already the fourth time that he has given an interview to Soviet television and been on your screens at home in the last year; so there is obviously no need for special introductions.

Since your time is calculated in minutes, let us get to work right away. I want to ask you, Secretary of State, to what extent, in your opinion, your present visit to Moscow has advanced the preparations for the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting?

[Shultz] Of course, we devoted great attention to the forthcoming meeting and achieved a lot. We have established the timetable, in the main; that is very important. Obviously, the most important thing was the talks, and we have already achieved quite a lot, for example, in the problem of nuclear tests, in chemical weapons, and in some regional issues. We devoted attention to the problem of human rights, humanitarian issues. As you can see, we have done a lot of work. Of course, very much depends on our bilateral relations, and the documents which will be prepared for the forthcoming visit.

[Zorin] What do you think: Are there chances that the knots which still remain to be untied will be successsfully untied, in order to make the summit meeting in Moscow fruitful [rezultativnyy]?

[Shultz] I think that there will be good results, and the very fact that there is a fourth summit meeting is a part of the changes in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Let us return to the summit meeting in Geneva in 1985 and compare the situation which existed then with the situation today. Look at how much we have already achieved and how far confidence has grown. We can solve problems if we sit down and work together. If we make such a comparison, we will see that something very important has already happened; and, without doubt, the forthcoming Moscow meeting will be a large part of this fundamental process, and we will also carry on working in that spirit.

[Zorin] Are there from your viewpoint realistic chances of a signing of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments at this meeting?

[Shultz] I do not wish to answer yes or no at the present. We have accomplished a great deal, but there still are some issues that are fairly difficult. Really, they are problems which simply require intensive work. Indeed, we are achieving results in resolving certain questions that there has never been success in resolving before. When responsible work is being done, each side of course shows care, because we want to be assured of its reliability. As the general secretary said to our President and the President said to your general secretary, we want to achieve a good treaty. We want to know where we are going. Therefore, we realize that there is still a very great deal of work.

The ministers will be meeting together again before the summit meeting. Therefore, I do not want to rule out the possibility of the signing of a treaty at the meeting, but I cannot guarantee it.

[Zorin] And another question for you. You turned out to be a good forecaster...

[Shultz, interrupting] Let me just add a couple of words. Whether or not there is an agreement, the work that has been done is already very important in itself. If an agreement is achieved shortly, that will of course be the best thing, and if not, I am sure that this work will not have been in vain. It will be continued, and the time will come when a 50-percent agreement will be achieved.

[Zorin] Well, speaking on a human level, I would understand you, if you personally felt a wish to finish the work that you have begun.

[Shultz] Well, of course, but it is nevertheless very important to see that the job is well done, when we are speaking of matters of such magnitude.

[Zorin] Let me ask you this: During our interview with you in Venice you made a very accurate forecast when you said that a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles would be signed during 1987. Many people, including myself, including myself, at the time had doubts as to the accuracy of the prediction. But you were right. However, during our last interview with you at the end of February you said that in your opinion the treaty would be ratified by the U.S. Senate by the end of April. One gets the impression that on this occasion your forecast is not being proved right. Why is this?

[Shultz] Well, you see, it simply required more time for the Senate to look into it, but the process is moving forward. In general, it is very well thought-out, and there

is very great support for this treaty not only in the Senate but also among the broad public in the United States. There was a very interesting vote in the House of Representatives. It does not have the power of ratification, but its opinion is very weighty, and a great deal of notice is taken of it. The House of Representatives voted last week, and do you know what the results was? Three hundred and ninety-three for, and seven against. As you can see, that is a very indicative vote; it shows the attitude toward the treaty.

[Zorin] Well, it remains for us to hope that there will be the same picture in the Senate. I want to ask you a question, Secretary of State, which has been worrying many Soviet people in the last few days. Why, in the runup to the summit meeting in Moscow, are statements coming out of Washington, the tone of which reminds one, in general, of times which were not the best in Soviet-U.S. relations, and which can hardly contribute toward creating the best atmosphere for the summit meeting in Moscow?

[Shultz] I don't understand totally what statements and opinions you are talking about, but I have no doubt that we will work in order to achieve progress in our relations. It is very important for both sides to engage in this, in a straightforward and sincere manner. I think that we agree with that, and we will continue our work.

[Zorin] I am pleased to hear what you have said, but I will not conceal from you the fact that certain remarks by President Reagan—in his speech to the editors, his latest appearance—have given rise to a certain amount of surprise among the Soviet public.

[Shultz] I don't know exactly which remarks you are talking about, but the President's views on what sort of approach there should be to Soviet-U.S. relations are fairly well known. And, from the viewpoint of his role in all this, I can say that during his Presidency we have seen a very active development of relations between our countries.

[Zorin] A question from a different sphere: In your opinion is the present election campaign taking place in your country having an influence on Soviet-U.S. negotiations and on your work which you are doing? And if it is having an influence, then is it for the worse or the better?

[Shultz] Of course, Soviet-U.S. relations constitute a very important part of our foreign policy just as your relations with us are a very important issue for you. This is the central problem. Therefore, of course, this issue will be discussed. But it seems to me that all candidates, both Democrats and Republicans, want to see progress along the same line that we are working on the issues of disarmament. This is not a generalization but our vow. And it seems to me that all candidates want to see progress in our relations if it can be achieved on a reasonable basis. Therefore, there is a bilateral backing for our course. And I think that the next President, whoever he may be, will continue to advance along the same road, and his course will not be very different from the road pursued by President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev.

[Zorin] This is a very interesting and substantial statement. Now I would like to ask you about the following. Reports have recently been appearing in the international press saying that it may happen that the circles that do not want progress in Soviet-U.S. relations could undertake in the weeks preceding the Moscow summit, some steps which, even if not preventing the meeting, may poison the atmosphere before this meeting. Do you think that such forecasts and speculations are founded?

[Shultz] Well, people are worried about this issue. We have had three summits and all three have been fairly successful. Each one differed from the other, each one succeeded in solving certain questions, and I am confident that the Moscow meeting will differ from the previous ones and that it will also be a unique and productive meeting.

[Zorin] Well, concluding our conversation, I would like to ask you a question which reflects my personal viewpoint and please, Secretary of State, do not regard it as a compliment. It seems to me that of all the secretaries of state who have held this high position in Washington in the postwar period the most impressive and specific achievements have fallen to your lot. Well, this is my viewpoint. In this connection, the following question: What would you like to complete your activity in this post with? I am far from prompting you to complete this activity—maybe if a Republican President is elected you will continue your activity—but nevertheless I would like you to tell our viewers with what would you like to complete the great activity you have managed to carry out?

[Shultz] I think that complete is not quite the appropriate word. The relations between our countries are relations that are always moving forward and, as General Secretary Gorbachev said in his book, we cannot get away from each other. We are two enormous countries and our relations will continue to develop. I think that they have now improved. They are better than when President Reagan and I came into office. Therefore, we want this progress to continue, and I am confident that after our talks with General Secretary Gorbachev, including today's talks, this process will continue. His view, which he expressed to me today, was the same. He wants to see progress in our relations. Therefore, if you ask me how I should like to complete my work, I should like to be certain that this progress in the relationship between our countries will continue.

[Zorin] Well, it remains for me to thank you. Your press secretary very strictly warned me not to go beyond the allotted minutes, and I should like to express the hope that we will be able in the future to continue the tradition

which we have already started of regular meetings with Soviet viewers and that Soviet-U.S. relations and their development will facilitate this. Thank you very much, Secretary of State.

[Shultz] Thank you. It was very pleasant to take part in your program again.

Shultz News Conference 22 Apr

LD222339 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1912 GMT 22 Apr 88

[News conference by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz in Moscow on 22 April; Shultz remarks in English with superimposed Russian translation; questioners unidentified—recorded]

[Shultz] I have just completed a rather intensive day and a half of discussions in Moscow: 9 hours with Foreign Minister Shevardnadze; 3 hours this morning with General Secretary Gorbachev. We covered all the issues that we traditionally speak about, and naturally we bore in mind that President Reagan will arrive here in something like 5 weeks. We discussed the timetable for the summit meeting, and by and large this timetable has now been confirmed. Both sides work on the concept that the summit meeting must be a substantive meeting; that it should advance the solution of those issues that were raised at the first summit meeting in Geneva in 1985.

I think it would be fair to say, speaking both for the U.S. side and the Soviet side, that the relations between the two countries have moved quite a long way ahead in various fields: human rights, bilateral relations, arms control, regional matters. So it may be said that matters are advancing. We may be proud of this, and we should like things to continue to move ahead and produce good results.

And now, permit me to dwell on those areas which we discussed. Above all, human rights. We had far-reaching discussions on this matter as a part of an expanded dialogue, which has already become established with us in the field of human rights and humanitarian issues. Before the ministerial meeting took place, experts on human rights worked for 3 days. We also discussed quite broadly matters concerned with the conclusion of the CSCE in Vienna. Now both sides note that they support a successful conclusion to the Vienna meeting. This conclusion must be a balanced one, so that progress may be recorded in the field of human rights, and also in the field of conventional weapons and in the field of confidence-building measures.

In the field of strategic offensive weapons and space weapons, we touched on a whole range of issues. We have food for thought. And both sides worked intensively and doggedly, but at the same time carefully. The point is that any agreement that may be reached must be a good agreement. A solid agreement. The U.S. side put forward a number of new considerations, and the Soviet side promised to study them. We also provided data on strategic forces for inclusion in the memorandum on agreement that is currently being drawn up, and we hope that the Soviet side will likewise provide its data.

Other issues were also discussed. In the sphere of space weapons we invited the Soviet side to submit a draft agreement. The U.S. side has already done so. As you know, usually each side submits a draft text, and then these texts are compared, work is done on them, and joint texts with parentheses are drawn up. The problems can be solved in that way. The Soviet side has submitted its text, so we shall now be able to move forward by working according to the traditional methods.

In the sphere of regional issues, for the most part we were discussing Afghanistan. We expect that the agreement will be successfully fulfilled, and that the Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Afghanistan on schedule and that conditions will be created which will enable the people of Afghanistan to determine their future. We also recognize that there are many problems in this sphere, but in general we hope a new page will be turned and that we're moving in the right direction. We still consider that it's high time we moved forward in discussing the question of the situation in the Near East. [Secretary Shultz can be heard saying in English: We didn't come to any practical agreement on that. The Soviets still seem to be reluctant to move forward] We discussed this in some detail. We remain willing to exchange views on this problem, but the sides diverge widely. Nonetheless, we'll keep in touch on this question, and we hope that in time we'll be able to move forward in a realistic direction.

In the field of nuclear tests we're making quite good progress. Our two delegations are working very hard in Geneva. These questions have been discussed here also. Everything is now practically ready for a joint monitoring [kontrol] experiment to be carried out. We also had some useful discussion in the sphere of limitation of chemical weapons. Certain new elements were introduced which enable us to reach agreement on conventional arms as well. These questions are being discussed at the multilateral talks.

In the sphere of bilateral cooperation a lot is now being done, and we think there are a number of supplementary issues that could be examined and decided in the sphere of transport, fundamental science, fisheries, sea rescue, and so on. Work will be begin soon on drawing up a new 3-year program in the framework of the plan elaborated by the general secretary and the President in Geneva in 1985. We are very much interested in setting up cultural and information centers in the capitals of the two countries, so you see that here a lot of useful work is being done.

I'll be visiting Kiev tomorrow, and among other things I'll be looking at the premises where our consulate could be situated. We are now actively examining the possibility of setting up a consulate in Kiev, and the Soviet

Union will open a consulate in New York. So on the whole, as you see, we've had, in general, a fairly typical but busy session. Where the possibility exists, we are striving for progress in each of the particular areas.

As before, we want to maintain the pace set, and as before to carry out the preparations for the summit meeting so that that meeting might be well prepared, and so that issues might be discussed at it in a substantive manner—important, major issues. And so that it we could confirm the elements of the process begun 2 and 1/2 years ago, and also the improvement in, and the constructive tone of, Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Question] On the arms control issue, if we believe that [words indistinct], then it would seem there is no prospect for the preparations for an agreement on strategic offensive weapons to be completed before the start of the summit meeting. Is this or is this not the case?

[Shultz] We have another ministerial meeting ahead of us. We shall again discuss these matters at it. We have already discussed this matter. As time goes by, it is getting harder and harder, but nevertheless I believe it is very important to continue to work and to forge ahead.

[Question] Those who are concerned with Reagan's place in history and with his image are pinning their hopes on the forthcoming summit meeting. Will these people be disappointed, since some might believe that this coming summit meeting will be nothing more than yet another round of talks about talks?

[Shultz] The question is what the talks and negotiations are about. I believe that this summit meeting, like the previous one, will be businesslike in tone, and that all issues of all sorts will be discussed. Therefore, one could speak of significant accomplishments within the framework of the forthcoming summit meeting. Incidentally, it will be the fourth summit meeting to be held within 2 and 1/2 years. And if we compare the present state of affairs with the state of affairs that existed in the middle of 1985, then you can see that it has changed abruptly. I believe that the meeting between the President and the general secretary, and also the tone, the content, and the direction of these meetings have played and play an important role in carrying through these great changes. I am sure that in this sense the Moscow summit meeting will occupy its appropriate place.

Shultz News Conference at Ministry

PM241527 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

["G. Shultz News Conference"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] In the course of intensive negotiations with General Secretary Gorbachev and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, we examined all issues which are customarily discussed in this context and, naturally, we bore in mind the fact that a little more than a month remains before President Reagan arrives in Moscow. This statement was made 22 April at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz.

We discussed the timetable for the summit and approved it in the main, he said. Both sides proceed from the fact that the summit must advance the solution of those issues which were raised at the first such meeting in Geneva in 1985. On both the U.S. and the Soviet sides, relations between the two countries have moved forward a fair distance in various spheres: human rights, bilateral relations, arms control, and regional issues. We can take pride in this, and we would like things to continue moving and produce good results.

The secretary of state dwelt on the problems discussed during the talks. He noted that human rights issues were examined in detail during the meetings with M.S. Gorbachev and E.A. Shevardnadze. There was extensive discussion of problems connected with concluding the CSCE meeting in Vienna. Both sides now note that they are advocating the successful completion of this meeting. I hope, the secretary of state said, that the present meeting can give additional impetus to the Vienna conference, just as, for instance, the previous meeting permitted the successful conclusion of the Stockholm conference.

In G. Shultz' opinion, the discussions held in the sphere of negotiations on strategic offensive armaments and space weapons were useful. Both sides, he said, have worked intensively, persistently, and meticulously. The agreement which may be reached must be a good, solid agreement. The U.S. side voiced a number of new considerations on sea-launched cruise missiles, and the Soviet side promised to study them. We have also submitted data on strategic forces for inclusion in a memorandum of understanding which is now being drafted. Various complex issues connected with the verification problem in the context of sea-launched cruise missiles were examined, and, it is true, we have not achieved any great results here. This problem is a complex one; verification is difficult to implement. The Soviet side submitted a whole range of proposals on this question.

Also discussed during the talks, the secretary of state continued, were questions of sublevels, questions pertaining to mobile ICBM's. They have not yet been resolved. The U.S. side proposed its own draft agreement in the sphere of space armaments. The Soviet side presented its own text. So that now we will be able to move forward.

On the question of an Afghan settlement, G. Shultz said: We are counting on the successful fulfillment of the accords signed in Geneva, on the Soviet troops' withdrawal from Afghanistan in accordance with the timetable. We acknowledge the existence of many problems, and we hope we are moving in the right direction.

We continue to believe, the secretary of state declared, that progress is long overdue in the discussion of questions related to the situation in the Near East. We are ready to exchange opinions on this important problem, but the sides are far apart on how this problem might be solved. Specifically, it is the Soviet side's opinion that the chief factor in the peace process is convening an international conference, while we believe that direct bilateral negotiations are the chief thing. Nevertheless, we will maintain contacts on this issue.

G. Shultz noted the progress achieved in the field of controlling nuclear tests [kontrol nad yadernymi ispytaniyami]. As he put it, practically everything is now ready for the implementation of a joint verification experiment [eksperiment po sovmestnomu kontrolyu]. We have also had a useful discussion on limiting chemical weapons, he said, noting that—in his view—certain new factors had been introduced which make it possible to reach agreement, as also in the question of conventional armaments. But clearly a final solution, G. Shultz stated, will be found at multilateral negotiations.

Concerning the exchange of opinions on questions of bilateral cooperation, the secretary of state remarked that a great deal is being done in this field. There is a whole range of additional factors which could be examined and resolved: in the field of transportation, the fundamental sciences, fisheries, rescue at sea, and so on. Work will shortly begin on drawing up a new 3-year program within the framework of the plan formulated by the General Secretary and the President in Geneva in 1985. We are displaying great interest, he said, in the establishment of cultural and information centers in the two countries' capitals.

Both sides are systematically and attentively examining the problems and the possibilities for their solution in all spheres of our relations, the secretary of state declared. Wherever possible, we are striving for progress. As before, we wish to maintain the pace established and to carry out preparations for the summit so that we can use it to confirm the elements of the process begun 2 and 1/2 years ago, and also to strengthen the constructive key in Soviet-U.S. relations.

Shevardnadze News Conference

LD222357 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Announcer] Comrade Shevardnadze answered numerous questions from journalists.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] Correspondent for GDR radio. Comrade Minister, what do you think? At what percentage, if possible, would you put the readiness of a treaty on strategic offensive weapons? The second question: As you said, there was talk about chemical weapons as well. In this connection, I would like to know how you assess the proposal to set up nuclear-weapons-free zones in Central Europe.

[Shevardnadze] It's hard to talk about percentages. If we're talking in overall terms—will there be an agreement—I think it's better to put the question like that—we're not losing heart. There is a chance of completing this most complex work, this most difficult work, but it's very hard. Every detail requires study, multilateral study, the involvement of major specialists and experts from the one side and from the other, the cooperation of scientific institutions both Soviet and American, various departments. So I can't say that an agreement will have been prepared by the President's visit. That's doubtful. But all the same, I do believe that since the Washington meeting, we have moved considerably on the issue of reducing strategic offensive weapons in conditions of observing the ABM Treaty. I said that undertakings have begun and I think that if there is no agreement at the Moscow meeting it will be possible to draft another document and in that document to register correspondingly the level reached, the progress we have made. It is significant progress in practically all directions.

[Correspondent] RIZOSPASTIS, Greece. You have said that regional problems were discussed in depth and that some common points of contact were found on a whole range of issues. Which regional problems, in your view, can soon be solved by joint efforts on the part of the United States, the Soviet Union, and other countries?

[Shevardnadze] You know it's so hard to cite any timeframes, but our discussions were, I would say, very productive on a Near East settlement, fundamental discussions, I would say. There are, I would say, divergences of principle but there are elements in common in the U.S. approach and that of the Soviet Union. There is a possibility of working on that basis. We then discussed the Iran-Iraq conflict. It seems to us that a start has been made toward settling this most complex conflict—I have in mind the Security Council resolutions and the very important factor of the celebrated unity of the permanent members and other Security Council members on this issue. We believe that there are definite prospects for uniting the efforts of the Soviet Union and the United States and other peace-loving states to find a solution to this most complex modern problem. [end recording]

[Announcer] Answers were also given to other questions.

Shevardnadze on Consultations

LD222005 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze held today a press conference at the Press Centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry. Addressing the Soviet and foreign journalists he said:

The meeting with the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev several hours ago ended the working visit by the Secretary of State of the United States Mr. Shultz.

I think that an hour or an hour and a half from now you will have an official report on that conversation. As far as I know the secretary of state has already shared with you his impressions of the conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev.

I would like to stress that that conversation is of fundamental importance from the viewpoint of the further development of Soviet-American relations. Of course, it is also important in terms of the contents of the forthcoming official visit to the USSR by President Reagan of the United States, the preparations for and holding of the fourth summit meeting. Very little time, slightly more than a month, remains before it.

But the specificity of our time is such that its dynamics is determined not by the astronomical calendar, not by number of days but by the quality of the decisions adopted by the sides, their readiness to search for and find mutually acceptable solutions, by understanding of the fact that the attainment of accord between the USSR and the United States is possible only on the basis of equality, equal security, account for the interests of each of the sides and of all other states and peoples.

When we speak today of progress, in a certain sense of the beginning of a breakthrough in Soviet-American relations we must realise that it was achieved precisely because of strict observance of these fundamental principles.

To portray matters differently, to contend that the agreements and accords between the USSR and the United States were not the result of their objectively coinciding interests and a manifestation of realism, but a result of some unilateral actions, of a policy from positions of strength means, to put it bluntly, irresponsibility and politicking in an area where there should be no place for this.

We would like to say this also in connection with some remarks made from the American side these days, true, outside of the framework of the Moscow talks. To put it mildly, they do not help the matter at hand, they give off false signals about what we can and must do together.

It would be a pity if somebody of us became frightened of the speed of advance and tried to put a brake on this very important process exactly at a time when many things have turned out to be possible.

This potential, this chance should be used.

Back in March in Washington the situation looked as if the USSR and the USA will not find a common language on Afghanistan. And a week ago the two countries have become the guarantors of the Afghan settlement. Having signed the Geneva accords we have established a new trend in the life of Afghanistan and the region as a whole and also promoted a more confident advance in our own relations.

Soviet-American relations are not a tournament in lightning chess, whose participants make speedy moves and feverishly press the buttons of chess clocks. It is far more important for us to know that the clocks of our contacts are synchronised for the achievement of weighty and stable positive results. We proceed from this in giving priority to quality, yes, quality of our arrangements, to their viability.

We get increasingly convinced that the Soviet Union and the United States of America can fruitfully cooperate and achieve much in the interests of its peoples and the entire world community. The amount of joint efforts results in a new quality of relations, so do not hurry to predict where we shall be in our relations in a month.

I must emphasize that the Soviet leadership is doing everything so that the Moscow summit should become an important milestone continuing the line of Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington, asserting the triumph of the principles of new political thinking over the policy of strength in international relations.

Now about our talks with the secretary of state. By the way, it was our 25th meeting in less than three years, a jubilee of sorts. And a jubilee is an appropriate occasion for making some general conclusions. A parallel review conducted yesterday by Mr Shultz and myself established a rather impressive governing dependence. I agree with the secretary of state that certain progress has been achieved on almost all directions of work. While in the past the dialogue could not get off the ground in a number of areas of negotiations, such, for instance, as some regional conflicts, humanitarian and other problems, the dialogue is going on now and the spirit of businesslike quest for mutually-acceptable solutions is characteristic of it. I would like to emphasise that it does not damage the interests of third countries.

Another characteristic feature of our dialogue with the USA deserves to be noted. This is now a thoroughfare with not just a two-way traffic, but a traffic of many lines.

A dialogue is conducted in parallel on four main lines:

The area of security,

Humanitarian cooperation and human rights,

Regional Problems,

Bilateral problems, bilateral relations.

The April round of talks with the secretary of state started with the discussion of humanitarian problems. We were, specifically, interested in an answer of the U.S. side to the proposals we had made earlier, in Washington, about creating the structures—along the line of legislative bodies, public organisations—for a regular exchange of opinions on humanitarian matters, for upgrading the system of legal and political guarantees of human rights, the development of people-to-people contacts and exchanges.

It should be noted that our discussions in this area assume a businesslike, concrete nature. Each side considers in earnest the questions connected with human rights, with the observance of international obligations in the humanitarian area. But the dialectic is such that this process must not mean interference in each other's internal affairs. This is our fundamental provision.

Regional problems were discussed in a most thorough way.

And this is quite natural. After the signing of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan, a hope appeared for achieving effective means for treating such an old chronic disease of the world as regional conflicts. Confidence strengthened in the potentials of the United Nations Organisation, in the possibility of achieving a desirable result by diplomatic process.

We have exchanged views on almost all conflict situations: the Middle East, the Iran-Iraq war, Central America, Kampuchea, the south of Africa, the Horn of Africa, Cyprus, the Korean peninsula. It turned out that virtually everywhere—somewhere more, somewhere less—there exists a common field, I stress a common field for action by our countries with the aim of creating favourable conditions for political decisions, given, of course, a heightened responsible approach.

No, we did not work out identical optics of perception of problems and we do not look at them with the same eyes. But I think we have become more objective in our assessments, including also of each other's intentions. This is very important.

We hold that our conversation with the secretary of state on regional problems was definitely productive and useful.

It goes without saying that the talks centred on security. Here the core issue is the drafting of the agreement on 50 per cent reductions of strategic offensive arms in conditions of observance of the ABM Treaty.

It is not a secret that until today's talks there remained five main knots without untying which it is impossible to achieve such an agreemen

As you know, they are the following:

—Non-withdrawal from the ABM Treaty within an agreed-upon period of time.

—Sea-launched cruise missiles.

—Air-launched cruise missiles.

—Mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles.

—The system of monitoring and verification as a whole.

These, as you know, are not new but very difficult and complex issues. On many of them as yet there even do not exist decisions in principle. But at the same time we have already approached such a line from which we can very quickly advance if we find the correct modus of solving them.

What is the situation after the exchange of views in Moscow?

I will tell you at once that we have not yet found a key to the problems.

But we now have a much better idea of what this key should be like.

New ideas and thoughts were expressed from both sides, specifications and new elements were introduced in positions on separate issues.

It can be said that a rather good groundwork has now been laid in Moscow for subsequent practical advance at the talks on the key problems connected with the treaty on strategic offensive arms.

There is progress along other directions as well. There has been a certain drawing closer of positions on questions of nuclear explosions (here progress is obvious indeed) and the prohibition of chemical weapons.

New ideas emerged, new proposals have been made. Our positions have been brought much closer.

And yet, frankly speaking, we had some disappointments. For instance, we were disappointed by the stand of the U.S. side with regard to the exchange of data on the correlation of armed forces and conventional armaments. The United States refuses such an exchange, at a given stage, in any case. And we thought this would be a good prologue to the talks on conventional forces, which should deal with the matter of eliminating asymmetries and disbalances first of all. You know how much ado, how much talk and speculation there were about all these asymmetries and disbalances. When we proposed that all the data on armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals be made public, not just general data on the whole of Europe, but also on regions, on Central Europe, Northern Europe, the south of Europe, etc. It turned out that our partners are not prepared to take such a decision.

In order to remove disbalances if they exist, and we know that they do exist, it is necessary to know well what they are in the practical plane, in comparisons, and to take concrete measures to be fully prepared to embark on negotiations on this problem.

One gets the impression that the NATO circles deliberately hold up the working out in Vienna of the mandate for the talks on conventional armaments. Agreement with regard to such a mandate in essence exists in a technical way, but not in a political way: It is sacrificed to the tactic of linkages with other matters. We believe this is impermissible.

Bilateral Soviet-American relations were also discussed at the talks in Moscow. It was noted that it has been possible to widen cooperation considerably in this area and to conclude some new agreements. Some agreements have already been drafted, some projects are being completed.

On the whole we assess positively the outcome of this meeting of ministers in Moscow. It has become an important stage in the preparation for the Soviet-American summit which is near.

There is an arrangement to hold another, 26th meeting of ministers in May. This attests to a bilateral striving to continue intensive talks, to carry the matter to the quest of arrangements.

Questions from journalists were answered.

Comparison of News Conference

Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 1912 GMT on 22 April carries a report on the news conference of Eduard Shevardnadze on the results of the U.S.-Soviet talks in Moscow. This report has been compared to the TASS version published above, revealing the following differences:

Paragraph ten, first sentence to paragraph fifteen, first sentence reads:...should be used.

Now to our talks with the secretary of state. A parallel review...(omitting passages.)

Paragraph sixteen, last sentence to paragraph seventeen, first sentence reads:...of third countries: That is a sacred principle, at least for us, for the leadership of the Soviet Union.

Another characteristic feature...(adding passage.)

Paragraph twenty-two, first sentence to paragraph twenty-three, first sentence reads:...of humanitarian problems. It should be noted...(omitting passage.)

Paragraph twenty-six, first sentence to second sentence reads:...all conflict situations. It turned out that...(omitting passage.)

Shevardnadze Hosts Dinner

LD221909 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze today gave an official dinner in honor of U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

Present at the dinner from the Soviet side were alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Defence Minister of the USSR Dmitriy Yazov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers Vladimir Kamentsev, Boris Tolstykh, senior officials of a number of ministries and departments, other officials.

Present at the dinner from the American side were the officials who accompany the U.S. secretary of state.

Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz exchanged brief speeches.

Shultz Tours Moscow Sights

LD221926 Moscow TASS in English 1849 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—On completing his talks in Moscow the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz went on a sightseeing tour in the Soviet capital. He was delighted to see a collection of icons in the Novodevichiy Monastery. Built in the 16th century, this monastery is one of the outstanding monuments of medieval Moscow.

Having much experience in construction, George Shultz, naturally, showed interest in the "secrets" of the ancient builders. The gilt domes of the towers, the majestic churches and the belfry are particularly impressive in fine weather.

The American guests saw the exhibition "Russian Masters of Painting and Engraving of the 16th-17th Centuries". Their attention was attracted by portraits of the Russian Czar Peter the Great and his first wife Yevdokia Lopukhina, who spent the last years of her life in this monastery and was interred there. During the tour a guide asked the secretary of state to guess the age of one of the paintings. George Shultz suggested that it was painted last year. To his surprise this "Still Life With Books" was created 250 years ago. The deception is explained by the author's original technique which to this day creates the impression that the painter had just made the last dab with his brush. The art of the ancient masters interested the guests from the United States so much that they braved the unusually low temperature (seven degrees Celsius above zero) in one of the temples.

Then the motorcade drove to the south-western part of Moscow and made a stop at the Cheryomushky Market, one of the biggest in the capital. The U.S. secretary of state remarked that there was an abundance of fresh vegetables and fruits that are unusual for central Russia at this time of year. He was told that the tomatoes, apples, pears and other produce were brought from the Central Asian and Caucasian republics. George Shultz also looked at stalls selling the produce of recently set up cooperatives.

A big crowd of Muscovites gathered around the American guest's cars and there were exclamations of "peace, friendship". A woman urged the U.S. secretary of state to work for world peace.

When the guests approached Arbat Street they got out of their cars because this short and narrow street in the centre of the city is open only to pedestrians. Several years ago Arbat was closed to traffic, the asphalt surface was replaced with cobblestones, attractive lamp posts were put up along the vintage buildings lining the street and Arbat seemed to return to the past century. Now it is a favourite place of musicians, artists, poets, singers and simply of people who like an unhurried stroll. And that was what the members of the American delegation did. There was an interesting scene near a stall of young artists. One of them recognised the secretary of state and offered him his painting. But George Shultz refused to accept the gift and asked the artist to name his price. "150 roubles" was the answer. This price seemed too high for the American guest. But after a brief haggle the impressionist landscape by 30-year-old Sergey Vasilyev got a new owner.

Wrap-Up of Visit to Moscow

LD231926 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

A regular meeting between U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze is planned to be held on May 11-12 in Geneva, it was learnt from the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs today.

By all indications, the ministers' meeting at Geneva will be the last meeting before the Moscow summit planned to be held on May 29-June 2.

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, who is now in Georgia, met with Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow on April 21-22 and held talks with Eduard Shevardnadze. All the aspects of relations between the USSR and the USA were discussed during what was the 25th meeting between the heads of the foreign policy departments of the two countries in less than three years.

The sides succeeded in establishing concrete opportunities for the further advance in every area of mutual relations by the summit and agreed that the Moscow summit should become another important milestone on the road to more stable and fruitful mutual relations.

During the meeting in Moscow the sides confirmed a firm pledge to exert intensive efforts to conclude the drafting of a treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms and all the related documents within the shortest possible period of time.

It should be noted that the last outstanding questions of the working out of the draft Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles were agreed upon as a result of the Geneva meeting between George Shultz and Eduard Shevardnadze on November 23-24, 1987, which made it possible to sign that historic document when the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee was on a visit in the United States.

Leaves for Kiev

LD230814 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0703 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr (TASS)—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz left Moscow for Kiev today on completion of the Soviet-U.S. talks.

At the airport he was seen off by Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, and other officials.

Arrives in Kiev

LD230651 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0645 GMT23 Apr 88

[Text] Kiev, 23 Apr (TASS)—George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, who is on a visit to the USSR arrived in Kiev from Moscow today.

Kiev Reports Shultz Visit

LD241027 Kiev in English to North America 2330 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Early in the morning today, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz arrived in Kiev. At the Borispol Airport, decorated with the flags of the United States of America, the Soviet Union, and the Ukraine, the guest was met by the Ukrainian Foreign Minister Volodymyr Kravets, the mayor of Kiev Valentyn Zgurskiy, and other officials. A special advisor to the U.S. President and the state secretary, Mr Nitze; deputy secretaries of state Mrs Ridgway and Mr Redman; as well as the U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Mr Matlock; also arrived in Kiev.

The secretary of state paid a visit to the chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers, Vitaliy Masol. Prior to the beginning of that meeting, the guest noted that apart from the official delegation, he was accompanied by a large group of journalists and reporters. So we hope that

people in the United States would see on their TV the beauty of the Ukrainian capital city, the openness and hospitality of Soviet people and their friendly attitude to Americans.

Vitaliy Masol acquainted the U.S. secretary of state and his party with the industrial potential of the Ukraine and its contribution to the USSR national economy. He complied with his guest's requests and told him about the key industries' development in this republic, including the farming economy undergoing radical changes. Both sides noted with satisfaction that the Soviet-American dialogue goes its way.

Evaluating the results of his talks with Soviet leaders in Moscow, Mr Shultz in part said this to Soviet and American journalists:

[Begin Shultz recording] You know these meetings that we have are like our relationship. Our relationship is complicated—we have lots of problems as well as opportunities, we have lots of difficulties as well as accomplishments—and most of the meetings I have had, in fact I think every meeting I've had with General Secretary Gorbachev, has had its rhythm. And there've been some very tough parts to every meeting—on both sides—he has things to say, I have things to say, and there've been (?those) sort of informative parts and their positive parts. So each meeting has its rhythm and this most recent one was no exception. [end recording]

The U.S. secretary of state made a sightseeing tour of Kiev and laid flowers at the monument to the unknown soldier in the Park of Glory. He paid a tribute to the memory of soldiers who died for their motherland by a minute of silence. Then the guest visited historical preserves: The Saint Sofia Cathedral and the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra. During his trip of Kiev, George Shultz went to the Babiy Yar and put flowers to the monument to Soviet citizens and prisoners of war executed there by the Nazis.

[Begin Shultz recording] We read about and hear about the massacre that took place here—over 100,000 people machine-gunned by the Nazis. The mayor described this to me in detail. We have to say to ourselves always: Never again, and the way to see that we have never again is to remind ourselves and never forget what took place. So it's always important to all of us—me, you, everybody—to come and remember and enforce our own determination to so arrange things that things like this, that are unimaginable and therefore so easy to allow yourself to think they just couldn't have happened, did happen. And by remembering them, do everything we can to see that they never happen again. [end recording]

Afterwards, the U.S. Secretary of State saw the buildings allocated for the U.S. Consulate in Kiev.

[Begin Shultz recording] It's an important city and it would be good for the United States to have representation here in Kiev and in this region. [end recording]

The Ukrainian SSR Government gave a luncheon in honor of the U.S. secretary of state. At the luncheon, the chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers, Vitaliy Masol, and the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz exchanged speeches.

Today, George Shultz and his party left Kiev for Tbilisi, the capital city of Georgia. The USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh and the Soviet Ambassador to the United States Dubinin accompanied the guest on his tour of the Soviet Union.

Leaves for Tbilisi

LD231210 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1125 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Kiev, 23 Apr (TASS)—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz arrived today in the capital of Soviet Ukraine with officials accompanying him.

George Shultz began his acquaintance with the city with a visit to the consulate which the United States intends to open here. Having looked round it, he told journalists that the opening of a consulate in such a major city as Kiev fully meets the interests of the United States. About five or six people will serve the diplomatic mission. The secretary of state explained that this is "related to financial problems."

According to information from Soviet diplomatic circles, an agreement in principle already exists for the opening of a USSR consulate in New York.

Then the U.S. guest visited the "Babiy Yar" memorial complex where there was a concentration camp during World War II when Kiev was occupied by the Hitlerites. A monument to Soviet citizens and prisoners-of-war—soldiers and officers of the Soviet Army—shot by the occupiers has been erected here. The secretary of state laid a wreath at the monument and bowed his head in sorrow.

The U.S. Secretary of State inspected the State Architectural and Historical Reserve of the "Sofia Museum" and the Kiev-Pecherskiy State Historical and Cultural Museum Reserve. After looking round, he said to journalists: "Such monuments, built many centuries ago, will inevitably stir those who have religious feelings. It gives immense satisfaction to see them."

Shultz left for Tbilisi today.

Shultz Arrives in Tbilisi

LD231418 Moscow TASS in English 1356 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Tbilisi April 23 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz arrived this afternoon from Kiev in the Georgian capital, Tbilisi. At the Tbilisi Airport, Shultz was met by Georgiy Dzhavakhishvili, the 47-year-old foreign minister of this Soviet Transcaucasian Republic, and other officials.

Georgia is one of the most ancient states of the Caucasus, and the head of the U.S. Foreign Policy department was familiarized in detail with its history. He was, specifically, told that Georgia, being situated at the crossing of routes between the East and the West, played an important economic and political role in remote times. It provided fertile soil also for the synthesis of the Western and Eastern cultures.

It is noted with pride in Georgia that the Georgian alphabet is among the most ancient in the world. The first literary monument that came down to the present, the authobiographic novel "The Life of St. Shushanik" dates from the fifth century.

Georgia is now a developed industrialised and agrarian republic. It accounts for 95 per cent of tea grown in the USSR and almost for the entire volume of citrus fruit. Georgia has a considerable share in the industrial output of the USSR. Trunkline electric locomotives, aircraft, electronic computing equipment manufactured in Georgia are known on the home and foreign markets.

Georgia's territory is 72 thousand square kilometres. It has a population of over five million consisting of dozens of nationalities. It never knew genocide or inter-ethnic strife.

Tbilisi which has a population of a million has been Georgia's capital for over 15 centuries. Tolerance of various religious creeds has always been characteristic of people of Tbilisi. This is shown by the fact that an Orthodox church, a Catholic cathedral, a Gregorian church, a synagogue, a mosque and several baptist prayer houses function in the historic centre of the city.

Confers With Georgian Official

LD231859 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Tbilisi April 23 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz arrived in the Georgian capital from Kiev this afternoon. At the Tbilisi Airport, Shultz was met by Georgiy Dzhavakhishvili, the 47-year-old foreign minister of this Soviet-Transcaucasian republic, other officials.

Before the plane touched down at the Tbilisi Airport, George Shultz held a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. He, specifically, announced that an arrangement on another meeting between the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state had been reached. The meeting is planned to be held on May 11-12 in Geneva.

Georgia is one of the most ancient states of the Caucasus, and the head of the U.S. foreign policy department was familiarized in detail with its history. He was, specifically, told that Georgia, situated at the crossing of routes between the East and the West played an important economic and political role in remote times. It provided fertile soil also for the synthesis of the Western and Eastern cultures.

George Shultz had a conversation with Chairman of Georgia's Council of Ministers Otar Cherkeziya on the same day. Great importance of the signing by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan of the agreement on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles was noted at the meeting. The agreement has become an important step on the road to a nuclear weapons-free world.

The importance of the widening of contacts between the USSR and the USA, which is a guarantee of the further deepening of mutual understanding and rapprochement between the Soviet and the American peoples, was emphasized during the conversation.

George Shultz was present at a gala concert in the State Opera and Ballet House. The leading artistes of Georgia took part in the concert. The state Chamber Orchestra conducted by Liana Isakadze performed in honour of the U.S. secretary of state the work "Summertime" by American composer George Gershwin.

In the evening the Government of Soviet Georgia gave a dinner in honour of the U.S. secretary of state.

Interview With Biryukov

LD241201 Moscow TASS in English 1128 GMT 24 Apr 88

["Remarks in TASS Interview by the U.S. Secretary of State"—TASS headline]

[Text] Tbilisi April 24 TASS—By TASS Diplomatic Correspondent Vadim Biryukov:

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has ended his four-day visit to the USSR. In the afternoon today George Shultz and the persons accompanying him have left Tbilisi airport on board the airliner.

George Shultz held two-day talks in the Soviet capital devoted to the Moscow summit meeting scheduled for May 29-June 2. On Saturday and Sunday the U.S. secretary of state visited Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, and Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia.

Before leaving Georgia by air George Shultz gave an interview to the TASS diplomatic correspondent. Evaluating the results of the visit, he said among other things, that at the Soviet-American talks in Moscow "we made headway, not dramatic headway, but we made the headway."

"As far as the meeting with the general secretary is concerned, it was a good meeting," George Shultz noted. "The Soviet leader "never hesitates to tell me about things that deep bother him, and I never hesitate to tell him things that bother me." "It was a productive meeting. And the secretary general told me that it was also his opinion."

Touching upon the Soviet-American relations, the U.S. secretary of state recalled that they have a "history that's been very tense".

At the same time he stressed that over the past two-three years we have put them "on a rather different footing. And we resolved some very hard problems. So that's good. And yet we have a lot of problems ahead of us and we should be frank about them. That's the way you get resolved them."

Touching upon his impressions about the visits to Kiev and Tbilisi, George Shultz expressed his admiration. "I find very interesting and extraordinary both places—Kiev and Tbilisi," he said and added: "There is a stretch of history behind them, and I realise what a young country I live in."

George Shultz pointed out in the interview that he was "interested in getting a sense of economical and political reforms I am reading about. What impact they have in particular places that are far-away from the capital. And I was interested to hear examples about things that are changing and to get a sense of interest and determination in different parts of the country, how people are interested in these reforms."

(The full text of the remarks by George Shultz in the TASS interview will follow later).

Tours Tbilisi, Departs 24 Apr

LD241210 Moscow TASS in English 1147 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Tbilisi April 24 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

The U.S. flag was hoisted over the residence assigned to U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz during his stay in Soviet Georgia's capital. But apart from that, another U.S. flag made of natural flowers could be seen on the flower bed in front of the mansion. The U.S. secretary of state had his photograph taken against the background of the flower bed. He exclaimed: "I have never seen anything of the kind. Then he went to see the sights of the city.

A panorama of Tbilisi opened to the distinguished American guest from Metekhi plateau, where Tsar Vakhtang Gorgasal founded the city fifteen centuries ago: The winding kura with picturesque bridges, ancient streets and temples of fanciful architecture.

"Please, accept as a gift from me and the residents of Tbilisi a picture of the ancient Narikala citadel," the 32-year-old artist Vazha Meskhi said, turning over his picture to the American guest. George Shultz wished to pay for the picture as he did on Friday in Moscow's Arbat. Yet the Georgian artist refused to take the money. Then the American guest decided to purchase other works by folk masters—a home-spun carpet and wine horns.

The American guests also found time today to visit the service in the Sioni Cathedral. "I am glad your name is George", Catholicos-Patriarch of all Georgia Ilya the Second said, presenting to the secretary of state an icon with the image of St. George—the protector of Georgia.

"The church preaches peace, we educate our flock in the conviction that people should be together, make friends and cooperate," Iliya the Second said. "We are glad that our countries have found common ground and are strengthening contacts." This was a well-addressed apt statement, since the U.S. secretary of state is a key participant in the Soviet-American dialogue, on which the destinies of peace in the world largely depend now.

The sunny, almost summer day turned the visit to the city of Mtskheta, the ancient capital of Georgia, into a real festive occasion. Many tourists including guests from abroad, admired the confluence of the Kura and Aragvi of amazing beauty, which was glorified by the great Russian poet Mikhail Lermontov.

On his way to Tbilisi airport to leave the hospitable land of Georgia, George Shultz visited the studio of Zurab Tsereteli, a famous Georgian artist. Tsereteli is known in the United States as the author of the works set up in Brockport University, decorating the U.N. building and the John Kennedy Library.

The guest showed interest in the models of the sculptured composition being prepared by Tsereteli for Reston, Washington's new satellite city. The centre of the composition symbolising the triumph of wisdom is an iron curtain cut in two, from behind which a man emerges.

Departure From USSR

LD241244 Moscow TASS in English 1203 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Tbilisi April 24 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz left the Soviet Union today.

Karpov Describes 'Key' Meeting

LD241622 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 24 Apr (TASS)—Viktor Karpov, head of the Problems of Arms Control and Disarmament Administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry, described the 25th meeting between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz as being a "key" meeting for the preparation of the visit to Moscow by U.S. President Reagan at the end of May.

In an interview to a TASS correspondent he recalled that only just over a month remains until the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. This time must be used efficiently in order to ensure that it bears results. There is a need for concerted efforts by the two sides. We expected the U.S. secretary of state to bring to Moscow a solution to the questions which up to now have not permitted the Geneva delegations of the USSR and United States to reach an agreement on the unresolved questions on preparing a package of documents for a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons, the USSR foreign Ministry representative said. These questions deal primarily with the implementation of the understanding reached between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Washington in December with regard to observing the ABM Treaty and abiding by it for an agreed period, and several key clauses of the draft treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons.

But this did not happen.

At the same time, the USSR Foreign Ministry representative noted the existence of positive elements in the "baggage" [as received] of the U.S. secretary of state. He announced, inter alia, the achievement of an understanding that the Washington agreement would be implemented in its entirety and that only essential clauses would be added to it, with regard to giving the document a legal character. This document will be accompanied by a protocol which will contain clauses dealing with verification, predictability [predskazuemost], and several other points which could make this agreement more effective toward observing the ABM Treaty.

"If the delegations in Geneva manage to prepare a document on this basis, this will be a great contribution to the preparation for the visit of President Reagan to Moscow," he stressed.

Dealing with questions concerning a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons, Karpov pointed out the existence of very serious problems, connected first and foremost with sea-based long-range cruise missiles. The USSR is constantly showing initiative, he said, in submitting specific proposals for limiting these weapons and verifying [kontrol] the proposed limitations. The United States in its turn merely expresses doubts as to the effectiveness of the limitations proposed by the USSR and suggests nothing in their place. This situation still continues. The U.S. Secretary of state brought no positive suggestions on this question, therefore the problem remains unresolved.

What the secretary of state was talking about—replacing the sides' obligation in this sphere by unilateral declarations which would not be subject to verification—cannot suit, since he does not essentially envisage any guarantees in the form of verification. The question of sea-based cruise missiles is a matter of ensuring the effectiveness of the agreement, that is, of closing off any opportunities for circumventing the levels envisaged by the agreement.

With regard to air-launched cruise missiles, Viktor Karpov went on to say, the U.S. secretary of state mentioned at the Moscow press conference that the United States had expounded its ideas on the question at issue at this meeting. This is indeed the case. However, one can already say now that the proposals expressed by the U.S. side are far from perfect and contain a whole series of unacceptable propositions which open up opportunities for circumventing the established restrictions. The U.S. side, for instance, proposes separating heavy bombers into three categories. The first is heavy bombers equipped with long-range cruise missiles with nuclear charges [zaryad]. Each bomber should count as one unit of 1600 launchers permitted to each of the sides, and as 10 units of 6000 nuclear weapons [boyezaryad] which will be permitted to the United States and USSR. [sentence as received]

The second category is heavy bombers equipped with bombs or short-range missiles with nuclear charges. Every such bomber would be counted as a single unit both in the total of 1600 and in the total of 6000. The third category is heavy bombers carrying any weapons, whether missiles or bombs, not equipped with nuclear charges. It would seem to be a fairly logical framework, but hidden behind the framework is the fact that the United States could in fact have hundreds of heavy bombers which would not be counted anywhere and which would not be limited by any methods, but which could be used as weapons, and with existing modern technology they could be refitted quite quickly as nuclear weapons launchers.

In other words, it is a reserve which would constantly give the United States the chance of increasing its number of nuclear weapons launchers. This is obvious too from the figures which the United States has given

the Soviet side with regard to the number of heavy bombers which they possess. Even now more than 200 heavy bombers which the United States has in reserve do not figure in this data.

It is clear that this approach to the solution of such an important question cannot be accepted and limitations on heavy bombers must be established that would correspond to the real state of affairs. This is in fact what the Soviet side is proposing: that each heavy bomber, regardless of its equipment, should be included in the number of strategic launchers—i.e. in the 1600 units—and its weapons should be counted according to its actual equipment. At the moment each of the United State's heavy bombers is equipped with 12 cruise missiles.

The Soviet side proposes a familiarization [dznakomitsya] of Soviet aircraft, each equipped with six missiles, and of U.S. bombers, and determining the number of nuclear charges which would be attributed to each heavy bomber in accordance with its type, as was agreed at the summit last December in connection with the ground-based intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based ballistic missiles, Karpov added. In this way, despite several new approaches laid out by the United States, a practical solution has not been found.

Viktor Karpov also noted certain positive moves with regard to mobile intercontinental missile limitation and control [kontrol]. The United States, he stated, clearly recognized for the first time at the talks that mobile ICBM's are a means to guaranteeing strategic stability and that control [kontrol] over them is possible if the proposals which have been submitted by the USSR are taken into consideration. However, on this score there is still a long way to go before the practical formulation of specific provisions for a treaty and its protocols.

The Foreign Ministry representative drew attention to the rapprochement which is emerging between the positions of the USSR and the United States on issues involving control [kontrol] which previously gave rise to certain difficulties and even incomprehension. This also concerns monitoring [kontrol] the production of weapons which are subject to limitation and mobile ICBM control [kontrol], monitoring [kontrol] the elimination of weapons which are reduced, and also the question of inspections of suspect sites. "It appears to us, Karpov said, that certain ideas expressed by the secretary of state deserve attention and we will be studying them".

To sum up generally, he went on, the 1,200 parentheses that remain in the draft treaty on strategic offensive weapons and about which the U.S. State Department was talking, present serious work that has to be done. At the same time their existence ought not to frighten us. These parentheses are the derivatives of unresolved problems. If the fundamental issues which we have referred to are resolved, then these parentheses will be removed and all the conditions connected to these issues in the text of the treaty itself, in the protocols, and in the memorandum on the exchange of initial data, will be resolved automatically.

This is what we were gearing up for when we went into the meeting with the U.S. secretary of state in Moscow. In some ways the discussions were useful; they clarified the standpoints of the sides and provided an opportunity to look ahead and to explore the paths toward an agreement. However, the fundamental discrepancies that, above all, affect the limitation of sea-based cruise missiles remain. Without these issues being resolved, it is hard to rely on a treaty on strategic offensive weapons being ready by the end of May. Although nothing is impossible. At the present stage, however, the preparation of a treaty depends on the U.S. side. Therefore the next meeting between the U.S. secretary of state and the USSR foreign minister will provide an indication of the United States' readiness or lack of readiness to come to the summit meeting at the end of May with an agreement on strategic offensive weapons, the USSR Foreign Ministry representative stressed in conclusion.

Reagan Makes 'New Threats' Against Iran

LD231952 Moscow TASS in English 1945 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Washington April 23 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan, in a traditional Saturday radio address, resorted to new threats against Iran.

He said that although "we do not seek to confront Iran", "continued military and terrorist attacks against nonbelligerents and refusal to negotiate an end to the war will be very costly to Iran and its people."

The U.S. sent its warships to the Persian Gulf under the pretext of defending tankers of neutral countries, thus aggravating the situation in that explosive region.

ASSOCIATED PRESS, commenting on the statement, said it coincided with reports about the administration's plans to expand the sphere of U.S. naval activity in the Gulf.

China

Envoy Briefed on Shultz-Shevardnadze Talks

LD231347 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1330 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr (TASS)—Igor Rogachev, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, and Viktor Karpov, collegium member of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, today received Yu Hongliang, Chinese ambassador to the USSR. They briefed the ambassador on the results of the 21-22 April Moscow talks between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

Philippines' Aquino Meets With Officials

PM221051 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Apr 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under general heading "The World in the Last 24 Hours": "China"]

[Text] Deng Xiaoping, chairman of the PRC Central Military Council, met with President Corazon C. Aquino of the Philippines, who is on a visit here, at the House of People's Assemblies today. Highly appraising the level of Sino-Philippine relations and the visitor's activity as head of state, Deng Xiaoping declared: China hopes that the Philippines will become a prosperous and strong country. "We can tell the whole world," C. Aquino said, "that the situation in the Philippines is stable." A meeting between C. Aquino and Zhao Ziyang, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, also took place in Beijing today.

Shakov Views Qian Qichen XINHUA Interview

OW230916 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 19 Apr 88

[From the "Current Events and Commentaries" program; station commentator Shakov on Qian Qichen's interview with XINHUA]

[Text] Newly-appointed Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen believes that the current international situation is conducive to the worldwide struggle for peace and development. In an interview with XINHUA, he pointed out that the INF Treaty, signed last December by the USSR and the United States to eliminate intermediate-range guided missiles, is a favorable factor to world peace. Our station commentator writes:

Many countries in the world, including heads of Asian-Pacific countries, support the USSR-U.S. dialogue on disarmament. Any progress in this area is of great significance to all countries and peoples. We suggest that all countries—large, medium, or small—participate on an equal basis in improving international relations so that they may measure up to the United Nations' ideal and principle.

The USSR has been working, in the spirit of honest, mutual respect and balanced interests, to establish glasnost and frankness in international affairs and counter the threat of nuclear and other weapons. Here also lies the crux of the USSR's proposal for a comprehensive security umbrella. This security system will encompass all aspects, including disarmament, settling disputes between countries, economy, etc.

Here we should again quote Qian Qichen in his interview with XINHUA. Asked about the progress in Soviet-U.S. disarmament talks, he pointed out that "dialogue is better than confrontation in alleviating tension." We cannot disagree with this.

Lately people are constantly talking about perestroyka. This is not an abstract concept. It is embodied in the INF Treaty and we have good reason to expect a USSR-U.S. agreement to eliminate 50 percent of their strategic offensive weapons. This will continue to be discussed in the upcoming talks in Moscow between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state.

YANGCHENG WANBAO Ponders Reform Tasks

PM211401 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Apr 88 First Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Uniting and Achieving Mutual Understanding"]

[Text] Beijing, 14 Apr—The reform currently under way in Chinese enterprises and other important areas of socialist building is a complex process. But—and this can be asserted with complete responsibility—the hardest thing about it is to restructure working people's awareness and ways of thinking.

Under the new circumstances, the newspaper YANGCHENG WANBAO writes today, this is the urgent task facing party organizations at industrial enterprises. The main conclusion they have drawn is that the way to influence working people is not through bureaucratic administration or supplanting of the administrative and economic leadership at enterprises, but through the launching and deepening of specific ideological political work linked in the closest possible way with the resolution of restructuring issues.

YANGCHENG WANBAO points out that the importance of arming the working people with Marxist-Leninist theory in the reform process is growing, and the role of the ideological and political education of workers and employees is being enhanced. People may have different opinions, ideas, or impressions. Party organizations should not divide but unite, they should not rebuff people but strive to achieve mutual understanding and—ultimately—to mobilize people to resolve the practical tasks emerging during the reform.

PRC Promoting Trade With Socialist Countries

OW230856 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] According to a XINHUA report, a foreign trade corporation has been set up at the instruction of the State Council. Organizations that trade with the Soviet Union, Korea, Mongolia, and East European socialist countries are under this corporation. As everyone knows, China has promoted trade with these countries in recent years. It has signed 1986-1990 trade agreements with Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, and other socialist countries, with the total volume of trade reaching 20 billion Swiss francs.

At a recent National People's Council session in Beijing, the deputies pointed out the need to develop trade with socialist countries. The foreign trade system reform being carried out in China this year will help such a development. China has given local governments more power to conduct import-export trade and set up joint ventures.

Economical, Political Benefits of Border Trade

OW230838 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 21 Apr 88

[(Alin) commentary]

[Excerpts] Dear listeners, in a recent interview with CHINA DAILY, Hou Jie, governor of China's Heilongjiang Province, disclosed that the province is ready to expand border trade with the Soviet Union. He said five additional trading ports will be opened this year for Sino-Soviet border trade. In this connection, our station observer (Alin) comments on the prospects for border trade between our two countries:

Heilongjiang was the first province in China to establish direct trade links with Amur Oblast, Chita Oblast, Maritime Kray, and Khabarovsk Kray in the neighboring Soviet border areas in 1983. At that time, the trade volume was only R6 million. In the past 5 years, it has multiplied sevenfold, while the variety of commodities traded has increased to about 200. The Soviet border areas supply China with all kinds of building materials, chemical fertilizers, household electric appliances, and machine tools and equipment needed for local industries. Motorboats, refrigerators, machine tools, and cameras are especially in great demand among Chinese consumers. In the meantime, Chinese-made thermoses, cloth, sneakers, and other consumer goods are in supply in stores in the Soviet Far East region. Undoubtedly, the full potential of Soviet-Chinese border trade has not yet been brought into full play. [passage omitted]

Under the economic structural reform being carried out in both countries, Soviet and Chinese enterprises, departments, and localities have been given greater decisionmaking powers in foreign trade. Not long ago, preferential treatment was granted to Heilongjiang to allow its prefectures, cities, counties, and enterprises, where conditions permit, to seek trading partners in the Soviet Union. Besides, export-oriented enterprises will be set up in the province to manufacture commodities especially to be exported to the Soviet Union. According to the Heilongjiang governor, this year Sino-Soviet trade volume will increase by 100 percent over 1987. [passage omitted]

In short, there is great potential for cooperation. Moreover, it should be pointed out that, aside from promoting the economy, border trade serves as a direct bridge of friendship and enhances mutual trust, understanding, and respect between the people of the two neighboring countries, continuously strengthening and expanding the traditional friendship between the Soviet and Chinese people.

Briefs

Publishing Links

Future plans of Soviet publishers producing books on science and technology are being prepared to be sent to the PRC. Literature to help Russian language students and dictionaries will also be sent. This was reported today at a meeting with journalists by Georgiy Ter-Gazaryants, first deputy chairman of the board of the Soviet Copyright Agency (VAAP). He headed a delegation of that organization which has returned to Moscow from a trip around the PRC. [Excerpt] [*LD210507 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Apr 88*]

Northeast Asia

Gromyko Meets Japan's Matsumae in Kremlin

OW230836 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Chairman Gromyko of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet held talks with Shigeyoshi Matsumae, president of the Foreign Cultural Relations Association of Japan, on 21 April in the Kremlin. At the meeting, Matsumae expressed his high appreciation for Soviet foreign policy initiatives as seen in the USSR's posture during USSR-U.S. summit talks. Chairman Gromyko emphasized that of all issues, a ban on nuclear arms is the most important.

Dobrynin Meets Japanese Communist Delegation

LD211433 Moscow TASS in English 1352 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS—On April 18-21 there were talks between the delegations of the CPSU and the Communist Party of Japan [CPJ]. On the Soviet side, they were attended by Anatoliy Dobrynin (head of the delegation), secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Viktor Afanasyev and Vadim Zagladin, members of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ivan Kovalenko, deputy head of the international department of the CPSU Central Committee. The delegation of the Communist Party of Japan included Koichiro Ueda (head of the delegation), deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Central Committee, Yoshinori Yoshioka, member of the Permanent Bureau of the Presidium of the Central Committee, Hiroshi Kikunami, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee, and Shoji Niihara, member of the Presidium and the Secretariat of the Central Committee.

During the consultations held in line with the joint statement of the CPSU and the CPJ in 1984, the sides discussed issues of cooperation between the two parties

in the campaign to prevent a nuclear war and to ban and eliminate completely nuclear weapons. In a frank and comradely atmosphere, they exchanged opinions on ways and methods of stepping up this campaign and promoting joint actions by peaceful and democratic forces on a broad basis.

The sides also discussed other questions pertaining to relations between the two parties. They confirmed the desire of the CPSU and the CPJ for raising efficiency of their interaction in tackling pressing tasks of saving mankind from a nuclear war.

Today the delegation of Japanese Communists departed from Moscow for home.

Soviets Deny Favoritism Toward JCP, JSP

OW230105 Tokyo KYODO in English 0926 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Tokyo, April 22 KYODO—Soviet diplomatic sources here denied on Friday that political favoritism affected the scheduling of meetings in early May between Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and leaders from the Japan Communist Party (JCP) and Japan Socialist Party (JSP). The JCP on Thursday unexpectedly announced that its No 2 man Tetsuzo Fuwa will meet with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on May 4. The JCP on Thursday said Gorbachev would hold a talk with Tetsuzo Fuwa, deputy chairman of the party's Central Committee, in Moscow on May 4, two days before the previously scheduled meeting with JSP leader Takako Doi.

"No priority was given to the JCP. The visit is the result of a busy schedule in Moscow," a Soviet source said in a meeting with reporters.

Fuwa is scheduled to leave May 2 for a regular consultation with the Soviet Communist Party. Doi will leave May 4 on a nine-day visit to the Soviet Union.

Japanese 'Defend-the-Constitution' Group Arrives

OW211305 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 19 Apr 88

[From the "Friendship and Good-Neighborliness" program]

[Text] A delegation from the Defend-the-Constitution Association of Japan arrived in Moscow on 18 April. The delegation is visiting the Soviet Union for 10 days at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace. Besides Moscow, it will tour Leningrad and Tallin. The delegation's itinerary includes visits to the World Economics and International Relations Institute, the Far East Institute, the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, and the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries. The delegation is comprised of 10 members and is led by Kosuke Uehara, Socialist Party member of the Japanese Diet.

Parliamentary Group Delegation Leaves for Japan

LD241641 Moscow TASS in English 1604 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 24 TASS—A delegation of the USSR Parliamentary Group, headed by Ivan Gladkiy, chairman of the group's Soviet-Japanese section, left Moscow for Japan today.

Report Views Japan-U.S. Cocom Talks in Tokyo

OW221255 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Report by correspondent Potapov]

[Text] Japan-U.S. consultations on the Coordinating Committee for Export Control (Cocom) were held recently in Tokyo. Radio Moscow correspondent Potapov has filed the following report:

The major objective of the meeting was to coordinate U.S. and Japanese actions in accordance with the results of the Cocom conference held in Versailles in January. As revealed by recent events, the main task of the annual Cocom talks was to prepare, under U.S. instructions, a black list of commodities categorized as strategic materials to be banned from export to socialist countries. According to information obtained from a source close to the Japanese Foreign Ministry, such a list applicable to commodities to be exported by Japan to the Soviet Union was worked out at the recent Japan-U.S. consultations.

There is no question that views were exchanged on tightening control. For the U.S. Government, Cocom is not only a regulatory organ for coordinating the trade war against the socialist community but also a lever to apply pressure on its rivals in economic competition. Currently the victims are the Toshiba Company and Toshiba Machinery Company. The U.S. Congress has included articles concerning sanctions against these two companies in a comprehensive foreign trade bill. Just like the measures taken 2 years ago to levy a 100-percent customs tariff on Japanese electronic exports to the United States, the sanctions will probably result in curbs on Japan's offensive against the U.S. market.

At the recent consultations, Japan requested the U.S. side to persuade its government not to approve the bill. However, Japanese economic experts maintain that there is little hope that the bill will be rejected.

At present, there is a growing anti-Japanese sentiment in the United States, particularly in the U.S. Congress, due to the U.S. defeat in the trade war. The Japanese Government is being criticized for refusing to open its

markets to U.S. construction firms and U.S. farm products. In stirring up the Toshiba Machinery incident, the United States mainly aimed at punishing its rival, Japan. At the same time, the United States is creating obstacles for Japanese business circles to promote their trade with socialist countries.

Judging from the trial of the Toshiba Machinery case which concluded in late March, the Japanese Government virtually supports this policy of the United States. At the current Diet sessions, opposition Dietmen have repeatedly stressed that the position the Japanese Government is taking does not conform with the changes in the international situation or with Japan's national interests.

Uno's Viewing of Northern Islands Denounced

OW230906 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] The Soviet newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA has carried an article on a recent trip made by Japanese Foreign Minister Uno to view the southern parts of the Kurile Islands, which are Soviet territories.

Uno viewed the Soviet islands for 2 hours, using binoculars. Those islands are the subject of a baseless territorial demand made by the Japanese Government to the Soviet Union. Four years ago, Japan worked out a comprehensive development project for what the Japanese call the northern territories. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA compares the project to the case of a well-known literary figure who, driven by his territorial greed, wished to marry two women at the same time. We cannot afford to dismiss the several Japanese politicians with such an illusion as being simpleminded. Japanese acts of reconnaissance against the Soviet islands constitute a major political issue and a serious barrier to the creation of truly good-neighborly relations between the two countries, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes.

DPRK's Kim Il-song Meets With Gen Lushev

PM251029 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 22 Apr—Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] and president of the DPRK, received Army General P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister, who is here on a visit at the invitation of the DPRK Ministry of the People's Armed Forces.

Korean People's Army Vice Marshal O Chin-u, member of the WPK Central Committee Politburo Presidium and DPRK minister of People's Armed Forces, and G.G. Bartoshevich, USSR ambassador to the DPRK, participated in the conversation, which took place in a warm friendly atmosphere.

DPRK Delegation Stops Over En Route to Zambia

LD241815 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1718 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 24 Apr (TASS)—A DPRK delegation led by Yi Chong-ok, member of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo and vice president of the country, stopped off in Moscow on its way to Zambia.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Razumovskiy Leads Delegation to Vietnam

Seen Off by Demichev

LD231124 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1030 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] At the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, a CPSU delegation has left for Vietnam from Moscow. It is led by Comrade Razumovskiy. Comrade Demichev and other officials saw off the delegation.

Opens Talks in Hanoi

LD241714 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Hanoi, 24 Apr (TASS)—A CPSU delegation headed by Georgiy Razumovskiy, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and CPSU Central Committee secretary, arrived here today at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV]. The delegation includes: Vadim Bakatin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Kemerovo Obkom, and Vladimir Grigoryev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Vitebsk Obkom of the Communist Party of Belorussia.

The delegation was met at the airport by Nguyen Duc Tam, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo, and by other officials. Among the welcoming party was Dmitriy Kachin, USSR ambassador to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

This same day talks began in Hanoi between the delegations from the CPSU and CPV. The Vietnamese comrades provided information as to the progress of implementing the decisions of the Sixth CPV Congress, the work on the new party program, and the strategy for the economic and social development of the republic. They spoke of the problems that Vietnamese Communists are encountering at the present time, and noted that the CPSU's experience is of great significance for the CPV in its work to overcome negative phenomena in public life, in the struggle for purity in the party rank and file, and for an improvement in organizational and cadre work.

The participants in the talks held an in-depth exchange of opinions on the fundamental questions of the organizational and educative work of the CPSU and the CPV, and on progress in restructuring in this area. Both sides voiced profound satisfaction at the successful development of all-round relations between the Communist Parties and the peoples of the Soviet Union and Vietnam.

SRV, India See Afghan Pact as Cambodian Model

OW231146 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 18 Apr 88

[Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] Nguyen Van Linh, secretary general of the CPV Central Committee, and Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi held talks in Ho Chi Minh City. After discussing the Asia-Pacific situation, they highly appraised the Geneva agreement on the Afghan question. The two leaders of Vietnam and India maintained that the agreement shows regional conflicts can be solved by peaceful means. To a great extent, their view can also apply to the Cambodian situation.

In this regard, our station observer Alekseyev comments: The Geneva agreement on the Afghan question is no doubt a great enlightenment as well as a first experience in smoothly solving regional conflicts. It is only natural that the two leaders of Vietnam and India have come to regard the agreement as a model for solving the Cambodian question.

The success of the talks on the Afghan question can be attributed to the following facts. First, the two sides maintained that differences in certain aspects of the Afghan situation should not become insurmountable obstacles to the signing of an agreement; and that it is particularly important for all sides involved to be sincere in seeking a solution to the conflict by peaceful and political means. Second, I would like to invite your attention to another aspect of the agreement on the Afghan question. The agreement only concerns itself with the international aspect of the Afghan questions and does not in any way involve itself in the issue of the sovereignty of the Afghan people. That is, the Afghans can independently resolve their own domestic affairs, including their domestic political structure, without outside interference.

To what extent can this agreement help solve the Cambodian question? Let us take up the domestic and international issues. Today, everyone who pays attention to the world situation knows very well that if there is goodwill, all sides concerned, including China, can help create favorable conditions for solving the Cambodian question as soon as possible. But under no circumstances should they undertake to solve the questions related to the sovereignty of the Cambodian people.

All nations that have roles in helping solve the international question of the Cambodian issue should not regard differences in the Cambodian issue as obstacles on the road to a future agreement. This is very important. We must strive to find a way acceptable to everyone involved for achieving the principal goal, that is, restoring peace on Cambodian soil.

Shevardnadze Receives Departing Lao Ambassador

LD231748 Moscow TASS in English 1733 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze received here today Ambassador of the Lao people's Democratic Republic to the Soviet Union Thongsavat Khaikhamphithoun in connection with his final departure for home.

Matters of further interaction in the international arena were discussed. The sides declared for a political settlement of the Kampuchean problem, the continuation of the dialogue between Hun Sen and Norodom Sihanouk, for the settlement of other conflict situations in the Asia-Pacific region by peaceful means, for the establishment of broad, equal and mutually advantageous cooperation of the countries in the area. This is the purpose of the proposals of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the People's Republic of Kampuchea to turn Southeast Asia into a zone of peace, stability and cooperation. The Soviet Union supports the constructive line of the Lao People's Democratic Republic at the establishment of goodneighborly relations with Thailand, the efforts of the Lao leadership toward the solution of disputed questions through talks.

The Lao side spoke highly of the Soviet Union's foreign policy initiatives aimed at the creation of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, the Geneva Accords on Afghanistan, which set a convincing example of peaceful solution of regional conflicts on the basis of the principles of new political thinking.

The sides expressed satisfaction with a fruitful development of fraternal relations and between the USSR and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, all-round Soviet-Lao cooperation.

The conversation passed in a warm and comradely atmosphere.

18 Apr Ceremony Noted

PM250817 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Order Presented to Lao Ambassador"]

[Text] In the Kremlin on 18 April P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR

Supreme Soviet Presidium, presented the Order of the Friendship of the Peoples to Lao Ambassador to the Soviet Union Thongsavat Khaikhamphithoun for his active work to strengthen friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Lao People's Democratic Republic [LPDR].

P.N. Demichev cordially congratulated the ambassador on the award. Mention was made of the great dynamism and full development of Soviet-Lao relations and the two countries' common positions on all the basic issues of the present day.

T. Khaikhamphithoun expressed gratitude for the high opinion of his activities. Noting the great significance of the Soviet peace-loving initiatives in terms of establishing the new political thinking in the practice of international relations, the ambassador said that the Geneva agreements on the settlement of the Afghan situation are seen in the LPDR as an event of historic importance which creates a positive precedent for disentangling conflict situations in other parts of the world.

On behalf of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, the LPDR Supreme People's Assembly and Council of Ministers, and the Lao people, the ambassador expressed profound gratitude to the CPSU, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Soviet Government, and the entire Soviet people for the constant assistance and comprehensive support for the LPDR.

Near East & South Asia

PLO's 'Arafat Arrives in Syria 24 Apr

LD251357 Moscow TASS in English 1327 GMT 25 Apr 88

[Text] Damascus April 25 TASS—Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, arrived in the Syrian capital Sunday for the first time since 1983, SANA news agency reported.

At the airport, he was welcomed by Sa'id Hammadi, member of the regional leadership of the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party (Ba'th), Syrian Interior Minister Muhammad Harba, Fatah Central Committee member Hayil 'Abd al-Hadim, PLO representative in Damascus Mahmud al-Khalidi, and the charge d'affaires of Libya's Bureau for Foreign Liaison in Damascus.

'Arafat is accompanied by Fatah Central Committee member Salah Khalaf (Abu Iyad).

PLO Officials Cited on Coexistence, Uprising

'Ready for Peaceful Coexistence'

TA222007 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1630 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Khalid al-Hasan, a PLO leader, told reporters in Brussels that his organization acknowledges the principle of two states in one land. We are realistic, he noted, and are ready for peaceful coexistence between the two states, one Jewish and one Arab, in Palestine. That is why the PLO supports convening the international conference. As to the fate of the two nations, the Palestinian nation and the Israeli people, this, after all, is in their hands.

This declaration is worthy of special attention because Khalid al-Hasan is the chairman of the Palestine National Council's foreign affairs committee. Additionally, his position fits in with many other recent declarations by PLO personalities. Not only is the PLO ready for peace with Israel and for an international conference for the attainment of a comprehensive settlement in the region, it is also prepared to take realistic steps on the basis of two states for two nations. In other words, it is ready to make efforts in the direction of the solution proposed, among others, also by democratic circles in Israel.

The willingness to coexist peacefully clearly indicates certain PLO commitments toward Israel; namely, the undertaking to terminate the armed confrontation as of the day a Palestinian state is established. As for the question of why the Palestine Convention, which advocates the establishment of a democratic secular state in all of Palestine, is not revoked, Khalid al-Hasan replied that the unification of all the parts of the land remains a vision. The Palestinians will strive to achieve this only through political means, which is to say that unity will be made possible only if the other nation wants it, too, and there will be no political clashes to promote this goal.

It thus follows that the Palestinians are expressing unequivocal readiness to find a settlement to terminate the state of war in the region and to guarantee the right of all the nations residing in the area to enjoy a sovereign existence. This, in fact, is also what the Israeli leaders call one of their foremost political goals. Yet Jerusalem is not prepared to consider the position of the PLO, the Palestinian people's sole authoritative representative. Furthermore, Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir never even reacted to Khalid al-Hasan's remarks, and other government officials never demonstrated readiness to recognize the fact that the PLO is stretching out its hand to Israel in an offer of peace. But this, in fact, should come as no surprise. In the past, too, the Likud leaders ignored all the declarations made in the Palestinian camp that attested to a willingness to make peace, recognize Israel, and conduct a constructive dialogue within the framework of an international peace conference. It seems that Shamir and his men prefer to sustain the tension and to block any change in the political mood in the Middle East.

But why? The answer is obvious: Not only does the right in Israel not want a settlement, it wants the opposite. It wants to prevent the promotion of the peace process by all means. The lethal attack on Abu Jihad [Khalil al-Wazir] was, most probably, also an attempt to fuel the internal conflicts within PLO ranks and encourage the

most radical faction in the Palestine national movement, thereby making the general situation in the Middle East far worse. The Likud leaders are masters at exploiting domestic Palestinian struggles to enhance the status of the rejectionist front, slander the PLO, and curb progress toward the convocation of an international conference.

Moreover, it is currently clear that the U.S. Administration can definitely influence the Middle East to move in the direction of peace. Washington's position must be taken into consideration even by the most inflexible men in Mezudat Ze'ev [Likud headquarters in Tel Aviv]. Against the backdrop of the latest developments, the signing of the memorandum of understanding on strategic cooperation between Israel and the United States is seen as an unambiguous endorsement of the rejectionist front of Shamir and the others. The United States has its own interests in the matter. While it can certainly gamble on escalation, particularly since it is so geographically distant from the Middle East, the people of Israel can hardly place their bet on this. After all, they are living in the Middle East, and will continue to live there. In the absence of a peace settlement, they can only expect additional unnecessary losses.

Envoy Condemns Israeli 'Terror'

LD221205 Moscow TASS in English 1142 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—"The terror and reprisals by the Israeli Zionists are powerless against the will and determination of the Palestinian people to gain freedom, independence and self-determination," said Sa'id Abu 'Imarah, acting representative plenipotentiary of the Palestine Liberation Organisation to the USSR.

"The assassination of Abu Jihad [Khalil al-Wazir], the harsh crackdown on the rebellious population of the occupied territories, as a result of which more than 40 people were killed in recent days, mass arrests, deportations, and blockades failed to douse the flame of the popular unrest," Sa'id Abu 'Imarah told TASS.

"The blaze is flaring more forcefully with each new victim. The policy of state terrorism which the Israeli leaders have been pursuing in the region since the moment when Israel was formed, suffers a fiasco. The Palestinian people wage a courageous struggle for their inalienable rights, the right to the homeland and the establishment of an independent state under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO), their sole lawful representative."

"Washington's hypocritical policy sparks anger and indignation among the Palestinians. In declaring about its 'commitment' to the defence of human rights, it does not undertake anything to stop its strategic ally, which practices genocide against the Palestinian people and, moreover, lends all-round support and aid to it," the PLO representative noted.

The signing of a memorandum of agreement by U.S. president Ronald Reagan and Israeli Premier Yitzhak Shamir, which is meant to forge still more the alliance between Washington and Tel Aviv, can be evaluated only as an encouragement of the Israeli Zionists to new crimes against the Palestinian and other Arab nations."

"We are not alone, all progressive mankind side with us. We are supported by the great Soviet people. The visit by Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, to the USSR and his meeting with the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev signalled a new stage in our relations, showed that our views on ways to solve the Middle East problem fully coincide. All this lend force to us in the struggle and confidence in victory."

Shevardnadze To Visit Mideast After Summit

No Plans To Include Israel

LD222317 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1943 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, April 22 (TANJUG)—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze told tonight's Moscow news conference that there were no Soviet plans for his visit to Israel.

The news conference was held over U.S. State Secretary George Shultz's visit to Moscow.

The Soviet Union and Israel do not have diplomatic relations and Israel knows what conditions have to be reached for the visit, Shevardnadze said.

Will 'Center' on Gulf War

LD250926 Kuwait KUNA in English 0831 GMT 25 Apr 88

[Text] Kuwait, April 25 (KUNA)—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will visit the Middle East shortly following the American-Soviet summit which will be held next month in Moscow, according to a press report here Sunday.

Daily AL-SIYASAH, quoting sources in the Soviet Foreign Ministry, added that Shevardnadze's tour to the region includes Syria and Jordan and possibly Kuwait.

Other diplomatic sources in the Soviet Foreign Ministry told the Kuwaiti paper that a head way toward breaking the stalemate in the complex Mideast issue of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Gulf war could pave the way for a possible visit to the region by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Regarding Shevardnadze's tour to the region, AL-SIYASAH learnt that it will center on the Iraq-Iran war. It noted that Moscow believes that any settlement to the Gulf conflict should be based on full respect of the two countries' rights and their vital interests.

According to the daily, several Soviet officials believe that Israel is very close to the Iraq-Iran conflict, and it found a gap in this war that enabled it to obstruct the mediation efforts aiming at ending the bloody conflict.

Iranian Speedboats Attack Liberian Tanker

LD242012 Moscow TASS in English 1941 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] London April 24 TASS—Iranian speed boats today attacked the tanker Sea Trader flying the Liberian flag at the entrance to the Strait of Hormuz, Reuters reported. The tanker sustained damage but none of the crewmen has suffered. The boats also made an attempt to attack one more foreign ship in that area.

Vorontsov Receives Iranian Ambassador

LD240855 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0840 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 24 Apr (TASS)—Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, received Naser Heirani-Nobari, ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran, at the latter's request on 23 April. The present state of Soviet-Iranian relations and issues concerning the Iran-Iraq war and the political settlement around Afghanistan were discussed in detail during the conversation which took place.

U.S.-Israeli Memorandum, Shultz Plan Viewed

LD221304 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Excerpts] A memorandum on an American-Israeli accord has been signed by President Ronald Reagan in Washington and Premier Yitzhak Shamir in Jerusalem. Commentary is by Yuriy Solton and this is what he writes:

This two-page document is teeming with terms like common goals, interests, and assets. It reaffirms Washington's adherence to what it describes as strategic engagement with Tel Aviv and points to the need for better coordination of bilateral efforts, particularly in the military sphere. It's for the first time ever that an official American-Israeli document openly states that the United States and Israel will engage in joint military planning, conduct joint military exercises, and take care of equipment supplied to the armed forces. The memorandum emphasizes that among the non-NATO countries, Israel remains the chief ally of the United States, and one can observe, by the way, this ally has been receiving American assistance, largely military assistance, worth an annual $3 billion.

The increasingly strong military alliance between Tel Aviv and Washington cannot fail to evoke concern. In no way does it facilitate the resolution of the protracted Middle East crisis, the most grievous and cruel one among the regional conflicts. [passage omitted]

Decades of unceasing fighting have shown, however, that the military fist cannot possibly help untie the Middle East knot. Washington officials seemed at one time to have become aware of this too. The so-called Shultz plan advanced there, for all its narrow-mindedness, generally recognizes the significance of collective efforts towards a Middle East settlement. But the latest memorandum, in placing the accent on military cooperation, deals a blow also at this plan, however scanty it may be. How can one possibly talk of political settlement and respect for the Arab people's interests while guaranteeing military and other support to Israel, which has been busy suppressing the Palestinian uprising in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories? Any attempts at achieving a settlement through force or without due account for the interests of all the parties concerned, including the Arabs, among them the Palestinian Arabs, and Israel, will inevitably lead to a deadlock and a further rise in regional tension.

Afghan Agreements Seen as Model for Mideast

PM221225 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Konstantin Geyvandov "Political Observer's Opinion": "From Positions of New Thinking"]

[Text] An event whose importance is difficult to overestimate occurred in Geneva last week. We are of course talking about the signing of the agreements on a political settlement around Afghanistan. It goes without saying that they are primarily linked with hopes that long-awaited peace will finally dawn over the long-suffering Afghan land and that that country's people will be given an opportunity to build their life the way they think best, without constant interference, on the basis of nationwide reconciliation.

But the importance of the Geneva agreements in question goes far beyond this, since the more one ponders the accomplished fact, the clearer its multifaceted symbolism becomes. For example, they can be seen as the first model for a peaceful solution of regional conflicts on the basis of the principles of the new political thinking. There are, therefore, fairly good reasons to hope that the signing of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan will give an impetus to the switching of other regional conflicts and crises onto the tracks of peaceful political settlement.

This makes it obvious that the recent development of events has created favorable prerequisites for unblocking the Near East conflict. And if all interested sides were to display good will and a desire for cooperation, it could become the next "hot spot" on the planet to be extinguished. The uprising of Palestinians in the territories occupied by Israel, which has been going on for 5 months now, has given another important push to the quest for practical solutions in favor of an all-embracing settlement of the Arab-Israeli crisis. This Palestinian people's movement is gaining growing international support and sympathy among the most diverse circles.

A "new U.S. initiative" for a Near East settlement emerged on the wave of the uprising by the population of the occupied territories, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz made two tours of the region one after the other, each one lasting several days. On instructions of the Arab League, a delegation of its specially set up "Committee of Seven" visited the Soviet Union to discuss practical issues concerning the unblocking of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It was followed by a working visit to Moscow by Y. 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee. The principles of the Soviet view of the essence of a Near East settlement were outlined during these meetings and conversations with Arab representatives, just as they were in the course of earlier talks with official Washington.

Let me briefly refresh people's memories about them. The most important prerequisite of a solution to this most difficult and most complex of several regional crises must be the withdrawal of Israeli troops from territories occupied in 1967—the West Bank of the Jordan, the Gaza Strip, and Syria's Golan Heights. At the same time, a comprehensive solution is needed for the Palestinian question, including the issue that is central for the Palestinian Arab people—self-determination. The Palestinian people have the right to self-determination to the same extent to which it is guaranteed for the people of Israel. The other question—as to the way the Palestinians would exercise this right—is something that is exclusively up to them.

The Geneva agreements on Afghanistan signed last week must, I think, be perceived as evidence that the United Nations, including its secretary general, has at its disposal effective mechanisms to restore and maintain peace. This is why the Soviet Union believes that the most effective mechanism for a Near East settlement is an international conference under UN auspices, all of whose participants are to be invited by the secretary general of this world community of nations. The legal foundation of the forum in question is to be provided by UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including their right to self-determination.

The composition of participants in the forthcoming international conference on the Near East has already been determined. They are the representatives of all sides involved in the conflict, including the Palestinian Arab people, and the permanent members of the UN Security Council. In the Soviet Union's opinion, the conference must be a flexible and maneuverable mechanism, presupposing various forms of collaboration between its participants within its framework. The task of the permanent members of the UN Security Council is to create a constructive atmosphere for the conduct of talks. They in particular could, either collectively or individually, submit proposals or recommendations for this purpose.

I must say that the Soviet Union's stance, which has been thus reaffirmed and which gives balanced consideration to the interests of sides involved in the conflict, has been highly appraised by all who sincerely desire the swiftest possible peaceful solution to the Arab-Israeli crisis. Only those who feel that such a turn of events would not suit them continue, just as before, to put wrenches in the works by laying the stress on far-fetched questions like PLO recognition of Israel, the resumption of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Israel, and so on. I say far-fetched because these questions were answered in a positive or exhaustive fashion a long time ago.

Arab states for example, including the sides involved in the conflict, already have, in my view, recognized Israel both individually and collectively. Egypt, for example, did so as far back as 1979 by signing a peace treaty with it. Other Arab countries did so indirectly at the Pan-Arab Summit Conference held in the Moroccan city of Fes in September 1982, and directly at an identical forum held in the Jordanian capital Amman in November 1987, by agreeing that the legal foundation of a Near East settlement must be provided by UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 together with all other UN resolutions on all Near East and Palestinian problems.

It is well known that the PLO took part in the work of both these pan-Arab conference and that it has nowhere and never distanced itself from their decisions. On the other hand, the United States and Israel perceive the acceptance of Resolution 242 as recognition of the legitimacy of the existence of the State of Israel, even though it simultaneously prescribed the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territories occupied in 1967. As regards the resumption of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Israel, it has been repeatedly indicated that this question could be solved within the framework of the preparation for and holding of the international conference on the Near East.

It must obviously be noted that the elaboration and adoption of the Amman resolutions on political solution to the Arab-Israeli crisis were by no means without difficulties. The people's uprising in the occupied territories had an even greater impact in helping the Arab states' leaders realize the importance of inter-Arab accord on the basic questions of a Near East settlement. A rather interesting fact comes to mind in this context. I was told in Damascus and Amman while I was there during the first tour of the region by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz that the leaders of the Arab countries he visited invariably telephoned each other to coordinate their stance and exchange information on the talks. This was evidently done also because they remembered Kissinger's "habit" of passing on to his Arab interlocutors contradictory "information" which was only to his own advantage.

According to news reports that are coming in, active work is now being done by Arab leaders to finalize what I would describe as a single stance on the question of

unblocking the Near East crisis. This work is duly accelerated by public opinion in Arab countries, which unambiguously supports the swiftest possible political settlement of the conflict via the convening of an international conference under UN auspices, to be attended by all interested sides, including the PLO, and the permanent members of the UN Security Council. In any case, this was the impression given by the work of the enlarged plenum of the League of Arab Lawyers Bureau, attended by representatives of other creative unions of the intelligentsia in Arab countries. This event, which I had an opportunity to attend, took place in Tunis in late March and early April.

The Soviet Union and the United States, as mediators and official guarantors of the settlement of the Afghan problem, have set a precedent of the constructive collaboration which is extremely necessary for the improvement of international relations as a whole. "If third countries," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, correctly said a few days ago, "are given an opportunity to build their foreign policy by taking their line not from total rivalry but from sensible and realistic collaboration between Washington and Moscow, this will change the entire nature of international ties. When this happens, the pluralism of interests in the world around us will indicate not a multiplicity of antagonisms but the diversity of opportunities for peaceful cohabitation between states and peoples."

The Soviet Union, approaching the problem of unblocking regional conflicts from precisely these positions of new political thinking, calls on the United States for such cooperation and collaboration in the settlement of the Arab-Israeli crisis. The only thing that is needed is to agree that the universal principle on which such a settlement would be founded would be to ensure a balance of interests for all sides and to seek constructive and mutually acceptable solutions to all aspects of the conflict. I don't think that anyone would object to interim measures and stages along the path to an all-embracing settlement which must, of course, be perceived and implemented within the framework of a plenipotentiary conference and must be linked to the end goals of unblocking the crisis.

What is the alternative to a peaceful settlement? Somber, to put it bluntly, even to judge by no more than recent events. As if it were not enough that so far there has been no successful start on implementing last year's UN Security Council Resolution 598, we have now witnessed the latest round of escalation in the Iraq-Iran war. The United States has sharply exacerbated the situation in the Persian Gulf by getting openly involved in military actions against Iran.

On the other flank, Israel—the U.S. strategic ally—has again started to engage in assassinations of Palestinian resistance leaders in third countries, in addition to the growing use of armed force to put down the uprising in the occupied territories. The goal is obvious. Afraid that the Palestinians' uprising would force them into peace talks on a Near East settlement, Israel's leaders are trying to provoke the PLO or part of the resistance movement to take radical measures which would give them an excuse to delete from the agenda the question of an international conference and political solution to the crisis.

To put it briefly, there is in fact no alternative here in terms of peace and security.

Misgivings Noted on U.S. Afghan Accords Stance

PM221345 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Apr 88 Second Edition p 3

[Article by M. Ponomarev under the rubric "International Commentator Replies to Reader": "Barrier to External Interference"]

[Excerpts] Our attention was drawn to a letter from Lieutenant V. Yurchuk which arrived in the latest post. He writes:

"It was with a sense of profound satisfaction that I received the agreements signed in Geneva on the political settlement concerning Afghanistan. They open the way to peace on Afghan soil. But there is something which alarms me. The Geneva agreements are guaranteed by the United States as well as the Soviet Union. Yet reports are coming in from Washington that the United States intends to go on supporting the armed opposition in Afghanistan and supplying it with weapons. How can that be?"

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA commentator M. Ponomarev has replied to Lt V. Yurchuk. [Passage omitted]

It must be emphasized that the agreements signed in Geneva by the representatives of four states in the presence of the UN secretary general and his personal representative establish all the necessary conditions for a definitive political settlement of the Afghan problem. The United States has no legal basis for supplying weapons to the formations and groupings waging an armed struggle against Afghanistan's legitimate government. Furthermore, by signing the Declaration on International Guarantees, the United States has adopted a commitment to "strictly refrain from interference and intervention in any form" in the Republic of Afghanistan's internal affairs. Thus, if the United States, Afghanistan, and Pakistan fulfill their obligations honestly, the political settlement and the establishment of peace on Afghan soil will become a reality. If the United States, despite having no legitimate grounds, nevertheless continues to supply weapons to the forces waging the struggle against the legitimate government, those supplies will still not be able to assert a decisive significance so long as Afghanistan and Pakistan (particularly in this case Pakistan) observe all the principles enshrined in the Geneva agreements.

Was the Soviet Union surprised by the ambiguous stance taken by the United States, which on the one hand acts as guarantor of the Geneva accords and, on the other, states that it is going to act as though those agreements did not exist? I think that such a "discrepancy" could have been anticipated. However, the strength of the Geneva agreements is that they do not permit support to be given to political and other groupings operating on the territory of the sides party to the agreement against the government of another party. These documents thus make it possible not only to unblock the situation around Afghanistan but also to set an example of the solution of regional conflicts in general by political means and by means of talks and compromise. [passage omitted]

U.S. Group Meets Soviet Troops in Afghanistan

LD232101 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 23 Apr 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; international news presented by Aleksandr Serikov]

[Text] The signing of an agreement to settle the situation around Afghanistan in addition to everything else opens unprecedented opportunities for contact and a frank exchange of views for, in particular, representatives of the Soviet and U.S. peoples. Look, for example, at the meetings that took place during the stay of a group of representatives of the U.S. public at one of the subdivisions of the Soviet troop contingent in Afghanistan. [video shows Americans and their buses; they meet a Soviet soldier; closeup of ABC news camera and of medals worn by Soviet soldier]

[Leshchinskiy, identified by caption] You have to agree that the arrival of Americans at all in the territory of a Soviet troop contingent is a far from common occurrence, and it is altogether the first time in Afghanistan. Therefore, from literally the first minutes of the meeting, the questions started—who's from where? How long have you been serving in Afghanistan? What military actions have you taken part in ? What are the military orders for? When are the troops intending to go home? Simple and understandable topics, it would seem, but imagine how interesting all this was for the Americans, many of whom have grown used to seeing the image of the enemy in the Soviet soldier. And how many stupid tales have they heard about the actions of our troops in Afghanistan. Now they've asked their questions and had a look—at the Museum of Military Glory, the soldiers' living quarters, and military technology, on which the U.S. television crews were even able to have a ride.

There was no caution, predjudice, or inhibition; and how good it is to shelter from the heat in a field tent. Incidentally, a significant event was marked here. Mrs. Gus Dunn, an eminent U.S. public figure and executive director of a major charity society, was 70 that day. Could she have imagined that she would celebrate her birthday on Afghan soil and, moreover, among Soviet soldiers in a tent covered with camouflage netting. Then came our turn to ask questions. She has worked as a teacher for more than 40 years and has been to the Soviet Union. Previously she had seen our soldiers only on parades in Red Square. What would Mrs Dunn like to wish these boys? As for all soldiers in the world, a speedy return home, healthy and unharmed. My brother, she said fought at the front during the world war for 4 years and my husband just as long in Indo-China. It's a very sad experience, and we must try so that it is not repeated anywhere in the world.

Fate of Soviet POW's in Afghanistan Deplored

PM221331 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 20 Apr 88 p 15

[Dispatch by own correspondent Iona Andronov: "'No One Is Forgotten' Is A Sacred Commandment: It Is the Duty of All People of Good Will To Help Soviet Soldiers Held Captive by Afghan Rebels To Return Home"]

[Text] New York—An exhibition of "clandestine publications" is on view in the reception hall of the New York organization with the pretentious name of Freedom House.

At the center of the exhibition, a book cover bearing an anti-Soviet caricature and a very insulting title about the policy of restructuring in the USSR arrested my attention. Similar libelous publications about Cuba and the European socialist countries were displayed alongside. A booklet there candidly explained that these "clandestine publications" are intended for smuggling into the Soviet Union. Perhaps only one pamphlet, being printed in English, had a different aim. Its title, "Soviet Prisoners of War in Afghanistan," struck a raw nerve in me, as I had been on Afghan soil.

The harrowed, exhausted face of a boy around 19 looked out from the cover. A second photograph showed him with other prisoners. Alongside stood three mustached men, automatic rifles at the ready. Skimming through the pamphlet, I came across the seering line: "Twenty-two of them were killed in 1985 during desperate attempts to escape." And there was also a description of how 12 captured Soviet soldiers held prisoner in a camp in Pakistan disarmed the guards there and tried to escape but, finding themselves unable to break out, eventually blew up an ammunition dump located in the camp, killing themselves along with the guards.

I had found out even before that the local functionaries of Freedom House take a close interest in prisoners not at all out of any noble, charitable feelings, but on the instructions of various anticommunist propaganda mouthpieces like the notorious Radio Liberty. The Afghan rebels, who usually execute Soviet prisoners after inflicting terrible torture, have for a while now spared individual prisoners and sometimes displayed them to visitors from American television, newspapers, and magazines.

The conservative newspaper NEW YORK CITY TRIBUNE, which has access to the corridors of Freedom House, reports that a special envoy of the organization has visited rebel camps in Afghanistan and Pakistan four times since 1983 to select from among the most exhausted prisoners those suitable for anti-Soviet purposes. Only 24 were found from among 300. Of those, to quote the Freedom House recruiting officer's expression, "seven are now dead," that is to say, they have simply been executed for not cooperating with the anti-Soviets. As a result, only 16 young men were taken to the United States, Canada, and Britain, although 3 of them had the courage to seek the aid of Soviet embassies and returned home.

The 13, when they first arrived at a military air base in Canada from Pakistan were, according to the WASHINGTON TIMES, almost incapacitated "under the effect of drugs." This mode of transportation was provided, as UPI revealed, by "Britain's MI6." A "special team of doctors" then treated the prisoners at the Canadian Air Force base and brought them round and subsequently, according to the local newspaper, the VIG STANDARD [name as published], "the people underwent interrogation." AP summarized the objective of the interrogations as follows: "The gathering of all manner of information about Soviet troops, their combat capabilities, tactics, and training." In conclusion, as AP summed up, the interrogees were threatened: "If they later take it into their heads to return to the Soviet Union, execution henceforth awaits them there."

Are they then really traitors now? Again, one should not rush to grim conclusions, since there are recent well-known cases where Soviet citizens kidnapped abroad by Western special services have nevertheless managed while under threat of death to outwit their jailers even during the most brutal interrogation and subsequently secretly regained their motherland, which hailed their courage and patriotism. This has proved possible for fully mature and very experienced people. It is, of course, easier to break, frighten, or confuse a 19-year-old with drugs and questioning. On this score the Freedom House pamphlet cites, clearly at other's prompting, a statement obtained in the United States from Vladislav Naumov, a young boy from the Volga: "It is now clear that we are not wanted by anyone. Even the Soviet Union has rejected us...." If we could only find out where Naumov is now hidden, we would, I hope, succeed in making him understand: Stop believing, Slava, what the anti-Soviets who have duped you say.

The new masters of the 13 prisoners screened out a further three—no doubt for "lack of loyalty"—and then, on behalf of the others, published in the American press on 12 March an "appeal" to the U.S., Pakistani, and UN delegations at the Geneva talks on Afghanistan. The "appeal" proposes to all Soviet prisoners that they "choose a place of residence in a free country." They are moreover intimidated: "After World War II Soviet citizens were forcibly returned to the Soviet Union." Additionally, Washington Congressman Don Ritter and Senator Gordon Humphrey called on 23 March for the U.S. Administration to urgently organize the mass transfer of Soviet prisoners to America.

This can no longer be ignored, in my view. The fate of tens or hundreds of our soldiers held captive by brutal murderers is now at stake. No civilized nation abandons its sons in misfortune, particularly when they are children, which is essentially what our young boys serving as soldiers in Afghanistan are. It is time to stand up for them publicly and as loudly as possible while it is still not too late to hope.

At the risk of alarming those of nervous disposition, I nevertheless consider it my duty to reproduce here just a part of the awful contents of the aforementioned pamphlet "Soviet Prisoners of War in Afghanistan," published in New York. The author of the pamphlet justifies the torture of the prisoners, but at the same time briefly describes the brutal treatment:

"Soviet prisoners live in ghastly conditions. Without any medical aid, they suffer from hepatitis, malaria, and a host of other diseases.... In the camps run by the insurgents commanded by Islamic fundamentalist Hikmatyar, Soviet prisoners are kept in darkness in underground burrows around the clock. One of the prisoners asked me quietly: 'Will you be able to summon representatives of the International Red Cross here so that they can see our suffering?' Many prisoners continue to be people without a future or a homeland."

Without a homeland? A lie! Our fatherland remembers them and, I am convinced, will never abandon them to their unhappy fate in a foreign land. Again and again we remember the sacred commandment inscribed on a great number of our war memorials: "No one is forgotten, nothing is forgotten."

Editorial office comment: The LITERATURNAYA GAZETA editorial office considers that today, after the adoption of the joint Soviet-Afghan declaration in Tashkent and the signing of the Geneva agreements on a settlement in Afghanistan, of which the USSR and the United States are guarantors, the Soviet and American public should immediately raise their voices in defense of those deprived of their motherland as a result of war and captivity. Humanity is an indispensable concomitant of peace and a condition of its duration. We hope that international human rights organizations and the whole world community will not stand aside here.

Murakhovskiy Meets With Afghan Deputy Premier
PM250901 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting"]

[Text] On 18 April, V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom, received M. Koshani,

deputy prime minister of the Republic of Afghanistan and chairman of the Afghan State Planning Committee, who had stopped off in Moscow on his way home from Poland.

During the meeting there was a discussion of certain questions of Soviet-Afghan trade and economic cooperation.

Anniversary of Afghan Revolution Celebrated

Orlov Leads Delegation

LD250851 Moscow TASS in English 0846 GMT 25 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—A USSR state delegation, led by Vice-President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Vladimir Orlov, left Moscow for Kabul today. The delegation will attend the celebrations of the tenth anniversary of the April revolution in Afghanistan.

Najibullah Cites Progress

LD250837 Moscow TASS in English 0807 GMT 25 Apr 88

[Text] Kabul April 25 TASS—A public meeting devoted to the tenth anniversary of the April Revolution has been held in the Afghan capital today. The meeting was addressed by Najibullah, the president of the Republic of Afghanistan, general secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee.

The path traversed by the country over the recent decade, he said, is equal to centuries in the profundity of its impact on the destinies of the Afghan people. History has proved that the activities of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan have decisively influenced the course of the political struggle in our country. The Geneva accords, the speaker said, are an important outcome of the consistent struggle by Afghanistan and the USSR for putting an end to interference in our state's home affairs. It is a victory for political realism and new political thinking in the approach to international affairs. Najibullah noted the Soviet Union's great assistance and said that the most important political development will be the return home of the Soviet internationalist soldiers who have done their duty with honour and helped Afghanistan preserve its sovereignty and integrity.

'Unsuitable Methods' of Revolution

LD242145 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 24 Apr 88

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Nikolay Shishlin; interview with Mikhail Leshchinskiy in Kabul]

[Text] [Shishlin] Right now we have the chance to talk to Kabul. Hello, Mikhail Borisovich.

[Leshchinskiy, visible on screen] Good afternoon, Nikolay Vladimirovich.

[Shishlin] As always, I have some questions for you, and the first one is connected with the end of the Geneva process, and of course all attention is now centered directly on Afghanistan and what is going on in the country. Soon the revolution marks its 10th anniversary. Elections took place recently. That is a kind of political barometer. So what is this political barometer showing?

[Leshchinskiy] First of all I have to say that the official results of the elections have not yet been published. But I would note right away that the very fact that they were conducted successfully says a lot, and is in favor of the present Kabul authorities.

A sufficiently large number of Afghanistan's inhabitants took part in the elections, although a little fewer than was assumed. But there are many reasons for this, you can understand yourself, the war, the disunity of the country, and vigorous propaganda from the other side against the elections. Unfortunately, the voting did not take place in certain polling stations in constituencies that were formed on the uncontrolled territory. But they still have the right to conduct these elections and send their senators and deputies to the National Assembly.

The social picture, as it were, of the voters is interesting. Young people were the most active voters. But this is not surprising since almost, that is not almost but 100 percent, of young Afghans were voting for the first time. The last elections were 20 years ago. The voting was high in Kabul's urban workers' districts, less high in rural regions. This is understandable too.

There were negative phenomena, which also showed once again the difficulty of the present situation. For instance, in certain constituencies attempts were made to apply pressure on voters by the local authorities and even certain leading figures in the PDPA. Soon the National Council will meet and the government will be formed there and its program drawn up.

[Shishlin] This naturally leads us to another question. The national reconcilation policy has been conducted now for almost 18 months. I understand that this is not a static policy, it is being modified in some way or other. How to date do both the national reconcilation course and those taking part in the dialogue, in particular the religious figures, look?

[Leshchinskiy] You know that the opposition up to now has rejected not only Kabul's peace proposals, but also the Geneva accords, any cooperation even with UN mediators, and so on. A course has now been taken toward a coalition with the second echelon, as it were, of the opposition. This concerns both the armed opposition and the political opposition, which generally joins forces with the religious opposition. Certain success has been achieved here already. Several major Islamic leaders

have arrived, returned home from Dehli. Important events have taken place inside the country too. An Islamic university has been opened, for instance. You can imagine the significance of this for the East as a whole. It is the month of Ramadan in Kabul at the moment, the so-called Muslim fast, if one can call it that. And the state here too is being very accommodating. The working day has been reduced for this month, since during the day Afghans do not have the right to take either food or water. It is, of course, difficult to work. The state is sending large parties of pilgrims to Mecca at its own expense.

[Shishlin] I wanted, since a spartan diet is in force with you under Ramadan, to suggest to you that you ask yourself a question. What question would you like?

[Leshchinskiy] Nikolay Vladimirovich, it is clear. The day after tomorrow the 10th anniversary of the April Revolution is being marked and I think that it would be interesting for me to answer and you to hear maybe about this path to the 10th anniversary, how the revolution itself and the process of its development are assessed today.

[Shishlin] Well, consider that that was the very question put to you.

[Leshchinskiy] Of course, over these 10 years you know there have been many changes in determining the nature and aim of the revolution. You know that the cart was put before the horse without justification, that the revolution was proclaimed as being almost socialist. But now it is quite categorically stated in PDPA documents—and this is in keeping with objective reality—the revolution is recognized as being national and democratic, national and democratic. What are the lessons from it? Above all, of course, many consequences resulted from precisely putting the cart before the horse, the desire to pass off what was desired as being reality, the quite unsuitable methods, I would even say violent methods, of spreading ideas that arose artifically, which had no social or historical roots in this country, and the conditions here had simply not matured for the lofty goals that they tried to declare here.

You know that the land and water reform was a failure, to put it bluntly, because it was conducted without taking into account the traditions of the people. You know that the relations with religious figures were made very complicated and the country of Afghanistan is religious. And the last 18 months are probably the most patent example of how things are being rectified, and realistic thinking is nonetheless gaining the upper hand over slogans and revolutionary phrases. And I should say that in the preparations for this festive occasion, the 10th anniversary, it would seem that there are grounds for organizing wide-scale pompous anniversary celebrations. But instead, it will be conducted in a businesslike manner here. And this seems very correct to me. The anniversary is being used to focus attention on what has not been done and past mistakes.

[Shishlin] All the best, thank you.

Najibullah Speech on Afghan Elections Cited

LD230046 Moscow TASS in English 1725 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Kabul April 22 TASS—The BAKHTAR news agency issued the text of the speech by president of the Republic of Afghanistan Najibullah at the final meeting of the Central Commission for the election to Afghanistan's National Council (parliament).

Najibullah said the elections had been an important event in Afghanistan's political life, the main factor of new state structure resting on coalition and a multiparty basis. The elections showed the enhanced activity of the population and its interest in speeding up the social and economic transformations in Afghanistan. Five political parties, six public organizations, as well as individuals representing various social strata of the society nominated their candidates for both chambers of parliament.

More than 150 thousand people turned out at polling stations every day, the president said. Altogether 1,547 thousand people took part in the elections. A large number of representatives of the opposition took part in the elections in 20 out of the 30 provinces of Afghanistan.

184 deputies were elected to Volosi Jirgah (the lower chamber of parliament), 115 deputies were elected to the senate. Pashtuns, Tajiks, Hazara, Uzbeks, Turkmens, Baluchis, representatives of other nationalities and ethnic groups were elected to the supreme legislative body.

At the same time, the recalcitrant part of the opposition tried to frustrate the elections in every way, Najibullah noted. 127 people were killed and 193 were wounded as a result of the shooting at polling stations and residential quarters in the days of the elections. The extremists downed two planes.

Afghan Provinces Prepare for Refugee Return

LD241516 Moscow TASS in English 1428 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Kabul April 24 TASS—Many provinces of Afghanistan are the scene of mass rallies and meetings devoted to the Geneva agreements these days. Speakers at such assemblies in Paktia, Paktika, Baghlan, Parvan, Konduz and Takhar provinces commended a constructive stance by the Afghan delegation at the Afghan-Pakistani negotiations, emphasized that the restoration of peace on the Afghan land becomes possible thanks to the national reconciliation policy announced by the

republic's leadership, BAKHTAR news agency reports. Residents of these provinces assured the country's leaders that they would exert every effort to put this policy into practice.

Another 65 families, who left Afghanistan, have returned to their native province of Paktia from Pakistan the other day. The local authorities extended the necessary material and financial assistance to them, put at their disposal vehicles to bring them to the site of their residence.

However, a successful organisation of peaceful life in the country does not suit everybody. Extremist groups continue with their armed raids. The security forces in Kabul Province have found with the assistance of the local population a large arms depo holding 83 ground-to-ground missiles and tens of mines in Bagrami District recently.

Syria, USSR Exchange Greeting on Anniversary

Syrian Premier Congratulated

PM221429 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 1

[USSR Council of Ministers greetings to Syrian premier on National Day]

[Text] To Comrade Mahmud al-Zu'bi, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Syrian Arab Republic

Comrade Mahmud al-Zu'bi, please accept cordial congratulations on Syria's national holiday, the 42d anniversary of the evacuation of foreign troops.

As a result of this historic victory, the road toward independent development opened up before Syria. During the past years of creative labor to build the national economy and implement social restructuring, the Syrian people have achieved major successes despite Israeli aggression and imperialist pressure.

Noting with satisfaction the high level of multifaceted ties between the USSR and Syria, which rest on the firm basis of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, people in the Soviet Union express the conviction that Soviet-Syrian relations will continue to develop and deepen successfully to the benefit of the peoples of our countries and in the interests of strengthened international security and the establishment of a fair and lasting peace in the Near East.

We wish happiness and success to you, comrade chairman, and the government and people of friendly Syria.

USSR Council of Ministers

Al-Asad Message

LD231503 Moscow TASS international Service in Russian 1351 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr (TASS)—Hafiz al-Asad, general secretary of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party and president of the Syrian Arab Republic, has expressed his sincere thanks to the CPSU Central Committee and the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet for their message of congratulations on the occasion of the republic's national holiday.

"The Syrian people," the reply telegram from the Syrian leader says, "waged a prolonged struggle for their independence, and since achieving it, they have directed their efforts at ensuring socioeconomic progress and the building of socialism. As they continue to struggle against Israeli aggression and the plans of imperialism and for the liberation of the occupied Arab territories and the establishment of a just peace, they place great store by the support of the Soviet Union. We in Syria are full of determination to continue further along the path of consolidating the relations of friendship and cooperation, which have been forged by the Syrian-Soviet treaty."

Admiral Sidorov Discusses PDRY Ties in Aden

EA231546 Aden ANA in Arabic 1330 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Aden, 23 Apr (ANA)—Comrade Admiral Sidorov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy commander in chief of the Soviet Navy, and his delegation laid a wreath today at the memorial to the unknown soldier. He was escorted by a number of military commanders of the naval forces.

The comrade commander of the naval forces and the military command of the naval forces later held a meeting with Comrade Admiral Sidorov. They discussed a number of issues of common interest which will lead to strengthening and developing relations between the naval forces of the two friendly countries.

Meets With Defense Minister

EA242129 Aden Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Brother Colonel Salih 'Ubayd Ahmad, member of the Political Bureau and minister of defense, received at his office this morning Comrade Admiral Vladimir Vasilyevich Sidorov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy commander of the Soviet Navy, and his delegation.

At the beginning of the meeting, the brother defense minister welcomed the leader of the Soviet military delegation and his companions. He stressed the importance of such visits as the fulfillment of the many great achievements which continue to be realized under the well-established relations of friendship and cooperation between the parties and peoples of the two friendly

countries in all political, economic, and military spheres. The brother defense minister asked the naval command to provide every opportunity to the leader and members of the Soviet delegation to acquaint themselves with the military structure of the naval forces and to fully utilize the great experience of the workers of the Soviet Navy in this sphere.

Comrade Sidorov and his delegation expressed profound gratitude for the generosity and warm reception accorded to them. They stressed the need to strengthen sincere relations between the CPSU and the YSP, between the peoples and armies of the two friendly countries, and, in particular, between the naval forces and the Soviet Naval Fleet. They expressed a desire to continue Soviet military support to the armed forces in Democratic Yemen.

The Soviet military delegation, accompanied by Colonel Husayn 'Ali Hasan, director of the Armed Forces' Political Department, made a study visit to Al-Rabishar Min Uktubar [14 October] and Al-Husayni farms in Lahj Governorate. The delegation listened to a detailed explanation presented by brother Muhammad Rashid Nasir, secretary of the Executive Bureau of the Governorate's People's Local Council, on the planning of these two farms and their contributions to serving our country's agrarian sector.

Kuwaiti Social, Cultural Progress Analyzed

PM221219 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by political observer Aleksandr Bovin: "Surprising Kuwait"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted outlines the rapid economic progress made by Kuwait in the second half of the present century due largely to its reserves of oil and praises its achievements in education, health care, and housing construction while also noting the importance of religion as a "stabilizing factor" in Kuwaiti society. However, Bovin also notes the presence of an "exploited majority" of foreign workers in the country whose social conditions are generally inferior to Kuwaiti nationals in every respect.]

Those are just some aspects of Kuwaiti life apparent to the outside observer. The leap from the middle ages to modern times has worked. The technical progress and material prosperity are striking. Great credit for that belongs to Sheikh Jabir al-Ahmad al-Jabir al-Sabah, the 13th emir of Kuwait from the al-Sabah family. He is a typical "enlightened monarch," if one may use a traditional European concept. This monarchy is not only "enlightened" but also constitutional. Which, however, did not stop the emir from dissolving parliament (the National Assembly) for an indefinite period on 3 July 1986.

Political parties and a political opposition are banned. The emir prefers patriarchal forms of "democracy" dating back to bedouin times—he meets with citizens, attends divans (private meetings and assemblies where various questions are discussed), takes part in all sorts of public ceremonies, and influences social security.

Journalists are kept on a tight rein. For example, the press carried a report on a meeting between the ministers of defense and the interior and the leadership of the Kuwait journalists' association. The defense minister stressed that the government had "cleansed" the press of those regarded as persona non grata and will support "sincere and able" journalists who care for the country's welfare: Those who are not concerned for Kuwait's interests must "go back where they came from." The interior minister recalled the importance of "self-control" and urged journalists to be "accurate and objective."

Accuracy and objectivity are indispensable qualities of real journalism. But when ministers insist on them in discussion with journalists, these words acquire a special and specific meaning.

I have not managed to acquaint myself particularly thoroughly with spiritual life in Kuwait unless you count conversations on religious themes. Passing impressions suggest that society's spiritual and artistic culture lag considerably behind the material cultural level. I am not about to examine all the reasons for that. But it is not impossible that one reason is the demand for "accuracy" and "objectivity" which the powers that be apply to spiritual leaders.

...One must pay tribute to people who have managed to utilize the wealth given them by nature to launch Kuwait into a new social orbit and provide hundreds of thousands of people with education, good housing, and material sufficiency. But what happens next? What direction will the evolution of Kuwaiti society take? Specific forecasts would be absurd and naive. Speaking in the most generalized terms the aspect of Kuwait in the 21st century will depend, I think, on whether the attitude of parasitism is eradicated, whether the necessary (optimum) ratio is established between "their own" and "other people's" labor, whether the disproportion between justice for "one's own" and injustice for "others" is reduced and eliminated, and whether material prosperity is increased and enhanced by the activation of Kuwaiti society's sociopolitical and spiritual life.

But in the end, what is least open to dispute is that only time will tell....

East Europe

Vorotnikov Departs for SFRY Visit

LD240943 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Comrade Vorotnikov left for Yugoslavia today on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Executive Council of Serbia and Montenegro. He was seen off at the airport by Comrade Solomentsev and other officials.

Zaykov, PZPR's Glowczyk Mark Treaty Jubilee

PM250935 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Fraternal Friendship"]

[Text] A soiree held in Moscow on 20 April is further evidence of the fraternity between the Soviet and Polish peoples. It was dedicated to the 43d anniversary of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance.

L.N. Zaykov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, CPSU Central Committee secretary, and Moscow CPSU Gorkom first secretary; Yu.P. Voronov, chief of a CPSU Central Committee department; V.A. Grigoryev, chief of a CPSU Central Committee department; V.G. Zakharov, USSR minister of culture; leaders of a number of other ministries and departments; and representatives of the public took part in the soiree. Also present were a Polish delegation led by J. Glowczyk, PZPR Central Committee Politburo member and PZPR Central Committee secretary, and W. Natorf, Polish ambassador to the Soviet Union.

A report was given by A.N. Aksenov, chairman of the Central Board of the Soviet-Polish Friendship Society and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting.

The signing of the treaty in 1945 was one of the most important events in the history of the Polish state, H. Bednarski, member of the delegation, chairman of the Central Board of the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society, and Polish minister of national education, noted.

The guests at the soiree, which was held in the A.S. Serafimovich Palace of Culture, took part in the official opening ceremony of the Polish Information and Cultural Center in this building.

J. Glowczyk and L.N. Zaykov wished the center success in its work at the new stage of restructuring.

W. Natorf arranged a reception on the same day to mark the treaty anniversary and the opening of the center. It was attended by L.N. Zaykov, other officials, J. Glowczyk, and members of the Polish delegation.

Glowczyk Visits Lenin Tomb

LD221246 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 22 Apr 88

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A Polish delegation, headed by Comrade Glowcyzk, Politburo member and PZPR Central Committee secretary, is in our country in connection with the 43rd anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between Poland and the Soviet Union. The delegation visited the Vladimir Ilich Lenin Mausoleum and laid a wreath. The Polish guests observed a minute's silence in memory of the leader of the world's proletariat, the creator of the world's first socialist state.

Yakovlev Talks With Glowczyk

PM250933 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] On 20 April A.N. Yakovlev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, had a meeting with J. Glowczyk, PZPR Central Committee Politburo member and PZPR Central Committee secretary, who has arrived in Moscow to take part in the opening of the Polish Information and Cultural Center in the USSR.

During the conversation, which proceeded in a cordial atmosphere, the sides exchanged opinions on questions of ideological cooperation between the CPSU and the PZPR in light of the decisions reached by the 27th CPSU Congress and the 10th PZPR Congress. They noted with satisfaction that in the year which has passed since the signing of the Declaration on Soviet-Polish Cooperation in the Sphere of Ideology, Science, and Culture a considerable amount of work has been done to further develop and deepen ties between the two countries' press organs, radio, television, and scientific, academic, and cultural institutions. They devoted a great deal of attention to the questions of ideological backup for the processes of restructuring in the Soviet Union and socialist renewal in Poland.

V.N. Sevruk and R.P. Fedorov, deputy chiefs of CPSU Central Committee departments, and W. Natorf, Polish ambassador to the Soviet Union, took part in the conversation.

Ryzhkov's Hungarian Talks, Results Reported

LD241300 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 23 Apr 88

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Konstantin Patsyuk]

[Excerpts] [Patsyuk] This week Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov paid an official friendly visit to Hungary. [passage omitted]

During Comrade Ryzhkov's talks in Budapest, particular attention was paid to relations between the Soviet Union and Hungary. Our correspondent in Budapest, Vladimir Stefanov, will describe a few aspects of those relations.

[Stefanov] During Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's talks with Karoly Grosz, chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, and his conversations with other Hungarian leaders, there was a very thorough discussion about problems of our bilateral economic cooperation. Such

problems do exist, despite the fact that overall Soviet-Hungarian economic cooperation is developing dynamically. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov stressed this once again at a news conference in Budapest.

[Patsyuk] Could you please remind us of those problems?

[Stefanov] The situation taking shape at present is that certain changes in the world economy are having a negative effect on our bilateral trade so that it is becoming imbalanced. This was threatening to reduce the volume of our reciprocal trade, which is unacceptable to either side. Very serious attention was paid to the problem during the talks.

[Patsyuk] What was the result?

[Stefanov] It was agreed that each side would take concrete measures to ensure that our reciprocal trade not only does not diminish, but will gradually grow.

[Patsyuk] Can you tell us some of these measures?

[Stefanov] Well, for example, it was stated at the news conference that a joint agreement had been reached for Hungary to open foreign trade missions in Leningrad, Kiev, and Tbilisi. This will stop Hungarian foreign trade from being focused solely on Moscow, on Moscow organizations and enterprises.

[Patsyuk] What will this give Hungarian specialists in concrete terms?

[Stefanov] The new trade missions will enable Hungarian specialists to establish close contacts with enterprises in other cities and republics, to come closer to the sources of information and expand their spheres of search for the goods they need. Another measure to be taken is as follows: There are great possibilities in the creation of joint enterprises and the expansion of direct production links between Soviet and Hungarian plants, factories, and research institutes. During his visit, Comrade Ryzhkov stressed on numerous occasions that all obstacles to implementing these new and progressive forms of cooperation must be swept away.

Soviet, Polish Trade Union Leaders Meet

LD231936 Warsaw PAP in English 1552 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, April 23—What part can be played by development of cooperation between trade unions of Poland and the Soviet Union in the processes of economic reforms, a PAP reporter asked leaders of labour movements in the two countries, of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU) Stepan A. Shalayev and chairman of the All-Poland Alliance of Trade Unions (OPZZ) Alfred Miodowicz, who met here upon conclusion of the "days of Polish Trade Unions in the USSR."

Stepan Shalayev said, i.a.: We attach paramount importance to the contacts with the OPZZ, with Polish labour organizations.

Both Polish and Soviet trade unions operate in the circumstances of economic reforms. Naturally, on some issues, such as that of workers' self-management, solutions of the Soviet reform differ from those of the Polish reform, which is perfectly normal.

But even with those discrepancies, we have great opportunities to exchange experience, for example, on the issues of social development in work places, accceleration of housing construction, or on principles of dividing the funds worked out by the enterprise among the crew.

As far as development of unionist Polish-Soviet relations are concerned, we held the operation of the OPZZ in high regard. On our part, we shall lend, as we have lent so far, our fraternal support to our Polish colleagues, the reborn unions, we shall develop comprehensive contacts, rendering them at the same time more specific so that the cooperation helps to solve selected important union problems. Also, we shall actively support, as we have so far, the reborn Polish labour movement on the international arena.

Alfred Miodowicz said among other things, that the Polish-Soviet cooperation of unions has a major role to play in the processes of transformations that take place in our countries.

But there are traps hidden in introducing economic reforms. For us such a trap is the policy on prices and incomes. In practice, there is, unfortunately, no effective control over the growth of convention prices under conditions of short market supplies and absence of competition. Our Soviet colleagues are certainly planning a price-income operation in future, perhaps not on the scale we had, but this seems inescapable. The success of such an operation can be seen in using wages as the chief driving force making the supplies bigger. This means that wherever wages are the yardstick of good work, growing efficiency, and high quality, it should not be limited in any way.

For the Polish trade unions the Soviet Union movement is a very important partner because of its being close, its area of activity, influence on the international arena. We have also learnt, to our satisfaction, that Polish trade unions also play a major role in the international contacts maintained by the Soviet Unions, Miodowicz said.

Ceausescu Greets Gorbachev During Overflight

PM251105 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Apr 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "From on Board the Aircraft"]

[Text] Overflying USSR territory on his way home, Nicolae Ceausescu, RCP general secretary and president of Romania, sent M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and A.A. Gromyko, chairman

of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, a telegram conveying ardent comradely greetings to them and best wishes for great new successes to the friendly Soviet people in the great cause of building a developed socialist society and communism and in the struggle to implement the noble ideals of peace, security, and fruitful cooperation among all the world's peoples. The telegram voiced the conviction that relations between the RCP and the CPSU and between Romania and the USSR will continue to strengthen and expand on the basis of the accords reached during the summit meetings and in accordance with the Soviet-Romanian Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance.

CPCZ Presidium Approves Husak Moscow Talks

PM221425 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Results of Trip"]

[Text] Prague, 16 Apr—A session of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium has discussed and approved the results of the official friendly visit to the Soviet Union by Gustav Husak, CPCZ Central Committee Presidium member and CSSR president.

The session participants emphasized the importance of the visit and talks held between the Czechoslovak leader and M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, A.A. Gromyko, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and other Soviet officials. It was noted that the process of restructuring and democratization which is under way in both countries in accordance with the decisions of the 17th CPCZ Congress and the the 27th CPSU Congress is creating favorable conditions for the further dynamic development of fraternal cooperation in all spheres. In this context the importance was pointed out of the concept of economic, scientific, and technical collaboration between the CSSR and the USSR elaborated for the next 15-20 years, which will provide the basis for the further development of bilateral relations and the achievement of important results in key spheres of science, technology, and production.

The Presidium noted with satisfaction the full unity of views in assessing the world situation and expressed a high appraisal of the USSR's active foreign policy. The session participants expressed satisfaction with the support given by the Soviet Union to the Czechoslovak initiative aimed at establishing a zone of trust, cooperation, and good-neighborly relations along the line dividing Warsaw Pact and NATO member states and also to other proposals aimed at disarmament and at relaxing tension in the world. Czechoslovakia will continue to strengthen collaboration with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the international arena in the interests of strengthening peace and security on the planet, the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium session stressed.

Soviet Cosmonaut To Direct Office in Berlin

LD230126 Moscow TASS in English 2117 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Excerpt] Moscow April 22 TASS—Soviet Cosmonaut Valeriy Bykovskiy left Moscow for Berlin by air today. He will live there with his family and work as director of the Soviet Science and Culture House.

Soviet Pilot-Cosmonaut Valeriy Bykovskiy, 53, is twice Hero of the Soviet Union. He was born in Pavlov-Posad, a small town near Moscow. He was put on the team of Soviet cosmonauts in 1960. He joined the team of cosmonauts together with Yuriy Gagarin, the world's first cosmonaut. [passage omitted]

West Europe

TV Interview With George Blake Reported

LD251257 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1920 GMT 23 Apr 88

[From the "Before and After Midnight" program; interview with George Blake, former member of the British intelligence service, by unidentified announcer in Moscow]

[Text] [Announcer] We have as our guest today a man of unusual destiny, at least my idea of unusual. His name is George Blake, and he is an honorary member of the State Security service who has been awarded the Orders of Lenin and the Combat Red Banner. Those awards alone lead us to the conclusion that George Blake belongs to the galaxy of outstanding Soviet intelligence agents about whom, because of the nature of their work, we learn only many years later, if we learn about them at all. Once one of the leading members of the British intelligence service, George Blake was arrested and condemned to the longest jail sentence in Britain's history: 42 years. A few years later, as I read in Western publications, George Blake made an incredible escape from jail and turned up in the Soviet Union. He is with us now in the studio. Welcome, George!

[Blake] Thank you.

[Announcer] I know that you can speak a great many languages—English, Dutch, Arabic, Fench, German, and Russian—but which language would you prefer to speak in now?

[Blake] Well, I think in this case it would be easier to speak in Russian.

[Announcer] Right, we will speak in Russian, then. Could you tell us, please, where you were born, who your parents were, and what sort of education you received?

[Blake] I was born in the Netherlands, in the city of Rotterdam. My father was of British origin, and my mother was a Netherlander. My father was a merchant,

and I was born into a bourgeois milieu. I went to a grammar school, and because the Netherlands was a very religious country before the war, I was given a religious education. In my youth I was quite a religious person and wanted to become a pastor in the Dutch Church.

[Announcer] How old are you?

[Blake] I am now 65.

[Announcer] What were you doing at the time you decided to help the Soviet Union, and what was it that induced you to do it?

[Blake] During the German occupation of the Netherlands, I worked as a courier in the Netherlands resistance movement. Then in 1942 I managed to escape via France and Spain to Britain. There I initially served in the Navy; then I was taken into the intelligence service because of my very good knowledge of various foreign languages. Soon after the war, after the capitulation of Germany, the British intelligence service began to be reorganized so that its chief target was the Soviet Union. It was then, on the principle that the better you know your enemy, the better you can fight him, that I began to read the works of Marx and Lenin. Then I saw that the Communists wanted to create on earth the same sort of society that was described in the Bible, the society of which I had once dreamed. I saw that the Russian people had undertaken a mission to carry out the experiement of creating just such a society, and that I should not try to damage or hinder that experiment, as my job then called for. On the contrary, I should help it in every possible way and (?spread the word). That was what I decided to do, although, as you must understand, it was a very difficult decision. It wasn't easy to come to that decision, but anyway that was the decision I made.

[Announcer] George, journalists and the public are very inquisitive, so if any of my questions cross the bounds of what you think is proper, please don't hesitate to put me in my place. I would like to ask you this: What do you think is the most important thing in your life that you have done for the Soviet Union? Could you recall a few episodes for us?

[Blake] Well, my job in the British intelligence service was basically to try to establish contact with Soviet citizens working in establishments of interest to the intelligence service, with the aim of recruiting them.

[Announcer] Excuse me, but just to make sure I understood you right: While you were a Soviet intelligence agent working in the British intelligence service your function was to recruit Soviet citizens?

[Blake] That was one of my functions, yes, but I was involved in one very interesting operation that I can tell you about briefly. In 1954, the British intelligence service discovered that approximately 100 meters from the border of the U.S. sector in Berlin, in other words on the territory of the GDR, there lay a Soviet military telephone cable. They decided, together with the Americans, to dig a tunnel and tap into that cable. It was a big operation, of course; the preparations took about a year. The operation was successfully accomplished, and it worked for about 18 months. Then the Soviet signals troops discovered, because of some technical fault, that there was an eavesdropping post there. In actual fact, however, the Soviet authorities naturally had known about the operation from the very beginning of its planning stage, but they let it go ahead, partially, of course, so that no harm would come to me.

[Announcer] George, I would, of course, like to hear about your incredible escape from jail in London.

[Blake] Well, as you must understand, being faced with such a long term of imprisonment makes a man want to do something about it. I was very lucky in that there were some good people who sympathized with me, people both inside and outside of jail, and who were ready to help me, so it went off successfully. First of all, I spent a few days in an apartment roughly 5 minutes away from the jail. Then I moved to another apartment a little further away. I spent about 2 months in Britain, then I managed to travel to East Berlin hidden in a van. And that is how I got to the Soviet Union.

[Announcer] Now you have been here for about 20 years. You probably found it difficult, particularly at the start, to get used to a new way of life and a different culture, did you not? How has your life turned out in the Soviet Union?

[Blake] Well, I can say that my life has been amazingly good, beyond all my expectations. Of course, as you correctly said, the first few years were difficult because I knew almost no one. In general, it is difficult for a man who has been in jail a long time to readjust to normal life. Here, for me was a different country, with different traditions and even a different society, so of course it was difficult, but generally, I began to make friends. I met my wife; I found a very interesting job with interesting and pleasant colleagues. Then my son was born, and my life took a happy course.

[Announcer] George, you are a professional intelligence agent. That means you inherently have a analytical way of thinking. You must be interested in what the Western special services think about the major processes taking place in our society, such as democratization and glasnost. What is your analysis?

[Blake] My view is that, of course, they do not welcome the restructuring in the Soviet Union because it is aimed at creating an efficient economy and a more attractive image of the Soviet Union, which may give other countries the idea of trying to create the same type of society. So their reaction is a negative one. I could quote something said recently by Mrs Thatcher, when she said that the attractive image of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev

is now the greatest danger for the NATO countries. She added that it would be better for the Russian bear to look and behave like a bear rather than for him to have the attractive image that he does now. That is what I think the attitude of the Western intelligence services is.

[Announcer] George, I would like to thank you for coming to our studio, and I hope very much that this first interview will be the prologue to a more detailed meeting with you and a discussion about your life. Before saying good-bye to you, I would like to ask one more question: Tell us, George, do you ever dream about London?

[Blake] No, I do not, but sometimes I have a great desire to see my mother's apartment in Rotterdam.

[Announcer] Thank you.

Gromyko Answers Finnish Delegation's Questions

PM250929 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 April 88 Morning Edition pp 2,5

[TASS report under heading "Celebrating the 40th Anniversary of Good-Neighborliness"]

[Text] Andrey Gromyko met with a large delegation of prominent representatives of different strata of the Finnish public in the Georgiyevskiy Hall in the Kremlin on 22 April. There were more than 200 of them. They all arrived in the USSR on the "Friendship Train" on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and Finland.

In the group were Martti Miettunen, state councillor, former prime minister and member of the center party (leader of the delegation); Erkki Kivimaki, general secretary of the Finland-Soviet Union Society; Taisto Sinisalo, chairman of the Finnish Communist Party (Unity); Henrik Lax, member of parliament for the Swedish People's Party; Ulla-Leena Alppi, deputy chairman of the Finnish People's Democratic League; Kaisa Raatikainen, member of the board of the Union of Finnish towns, former minister of internal affairs and member of the Social Democratic Party of Finland; Sakari Valli, member of parliament for the National Coalition Party, other members of parliament; representatives of political parties, state and public organizations; activists of the Finland-Soviet Union Society; trades union workers; leaders of womens and youth organizations; representatives of business circles; figures of culture; and journalists from various branches of the mass media.

Andrey Gromyko greeted the guests, and remarked on the noteworthy fact that the meeting is taking place on the anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth, at whose hands Finland received independence. Then he answered questions from those present.

Question: Why, in the course of restructuring in the Soviet Union, is such great importance attached to democratization, which is defined as the core of restructuring and its main essence?

Answer: Restructuring of the economic, social and other spheres of our society's life is under way in the USSR. Our party has mapped out a strategy of accelerating social and economic growth on the basis of the comprehensive intensification of production, structural reform in the economy, the creation of effective forms of management, organization and stimulation of labor and active social policy.

Naturally, the question arises: What guarantees the implementation of this program? The party and the Soviet people see the main guarantee of the irreversibility of these processes in the expansion and deepening of socialist democracy. Yes, it strengthens in the Soviet people the sense of their own responsibility for the country's destinies and personal involvement and interest in public affairs.

Question: How is the democratization of Soviet society being carried out in general, and how is it manifesting itself in the activity of soviets at all levels?

Answer: How is the process of democratization going in general? I will answer thus: It is going okay. At the same time, it is going in a complicated manner, which is not surprising.

Turn over the pages of our newspapers and, as in a mirror, you will see the whole range of colors of democracy and the popular initiative that has been stirred up. Attend meetings of our labor collectives, the creative unions, or listen to scientific discussions, and you will see that democratization is penetrating all pores of our society. People are discussing topical issues, speaking about them, comparing various alternatives, and seeking the most valid solutions.

In the activity of soviets, many sides of democratization can be seen, too. Stagnant forms of work are being overcome, bureaucracy is being combatted, and command and administrative methods of leadership are being ousted.

If we take the USSR Supreme Soviet, particularly its recent session, it is impossible not to find that all deputies' speeches at these are direct, honest, open, and permeated with a sense of high responsibility for the fate of restructuring. The word of criticism often resounds from the rostrum of the session, and deputies submit questions to ministries and other departments.

Features of a truly democratic approach are showing through increasingly distinctly in the practice of the local soviets as well. The bodies of authority now, as a rule, make decisions of public significance following preliminary discussion with people at grassroots level and taking their views into account.

It is not easy to grasp the science of democracy, breaking stereotypes and asserting the new inquisitive thinking. However, we view this process as natural. It must become a public norm of life.

Question: What are the soviets' main tasks in the contemporary phase of renewing socialist society?

Answer: The question of fundamentally raising the role of the soviets as the pivot of our society's political system is posed today in all its urgency. The soviets at all levels must be made really working, enterprising, and authoritative centers of state power and control and the genuine, caring masters of their territories. There are more than 52,500 local soviets alone in our country. More than 2.3 million deputies have been elected to them. So it is necessary for this vast force to be mobilized to full capacity.

Issues linked to the activity of the soviets and to raising their role are proposed for discussion in the summer of this year at the forthcoming 19th all-union party conference. We are thinking how best to delimit the functions of state and party bodies, purge them of formalism, breathe new life into the soviets, and perfect the electoral system.

Question: How is the increase in the role of local soviets being manifested at present?

Answer: The process of stepping up and improving the work of local soviets is under way. Maybe it is not proceeding quite as fast as one would wish, but it is under way. More responsibility, more of a businesslike approach, and more initiative, specificity, and glasnost are appearing in the work of the soviets. There has already been a marked increase in their influence in all spheres of life, and their authority among the population is being enhanced and must be enhanced.

But the main thing now determining the increase in the role of the soviets is an intensification of their real influence on tackling problems connected with an intergrated economic and social development of the territories under the jurisdiction of the soviets.

The goal of the integrated development of the territories is to create a production and social structure and an organization of housing and municipal services, trade, public catering, health care, education, and consumer services that would ensure high production indices at enterprises and, at the same time, favorable working and living conditions for people and a normal ecological situation in the region.

Question: What are the Soviet Union's foreign policy aims in the period of restructuring?

Answer: On the very first day of Soviet power, we stated that we need peace, not war.

The present restructuring is a profound, revolutionary process of transformations within our country. We wish, of course, to ensure for it favorable conditions in foreign affairs, but that is not all. It follows from the very essence of restructuring that we want much more. We want to rid mankind of the threat of self-annihilation and altogether to remove the notion of military conflict from our existence.

This is the source of our program for strategic actions. It includes Milhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement on 15 January 1986, which set out an integral system of measures to ensure security through disarmament, and primarily through the total elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

It includes the concept of a comprehensive system of international security, which was proclaimed at the 27th CPSU Congress. The system is based on a course of making the world more humanitarian, humane, and nonviolent.

We have developed this general strategic line further into comprehensive regional programs for strengthening security and cooperation: the Vladivostok program for Asis and the Pacific, the concept of the common European home, the Murmansk program for northern Europe and the Arctic as a whole, and the Belgrade program for southern Europe and the Mediterranean area.

The route of the actions, which has traveled via the Soviet-U.S. meetings in Geneva and Reykjavik, led to Washington and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. A start has been made to moving toward halving strategic offensive arms in conditions of compliance with the ABM Treaty.

Intermediate stations along the route of further movement of the disarmament process are now already visible. They include a convention on banning chemical weapons and eliminating their stockpiles, talks on reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, and accords on limiting the numbers and yields of nuclear tests along the way to their total prohibition.

The path to be traveled is, of course, still long and complex. Only painstaking work at the negotiating forums will make it possible to find generally acceptable solutions. We are attuned for such work, resolutely attuned for it.

Question: May 1988 sees the 25th anniversary of Urho Kekkonen's proposal for a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. How is the significance of this proposal viewed in light of the new political thinking in contemporary conditions?

Answer: The attitude toward proposals for a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe like, incidentally, that toward similar zones in other parts of our continent and in the world in general, is a kind of "litmus test" to see if the new political thinking has caught on. In other words, it is a test which shows how deeply one or another politician, one or another government or movement, realizes the realities of our nuclear missile age. It also shows what choice it makes in this—in favor of peace and survival of mankind, or whether it goes down the road toward nuclear catastrophe.

We reckon that Finland's proposal becomes increasingly topical with every passing year.

For our part, we have repeatedly stated our readiness to provide guarantees for such a nuclear-free zone in any form, and to implement measures on our own territory adjacent to the zone, and substantial measures, which would help to strengthen its nuclear-free status. We have already implemented individual measures. We have withdrawn several divisions of operational-tactical missiles from the regions of the Leningrad and Baltic Military Districts and restricted the number and scale of military exercises in those regions. So we will not hold things up. But it is up to you northerners to resolve this question.

Question: In his speech in Helsinki 15 October 1986, Mauno Koivisto advocated a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. What is your assessment of the possibilities of ensuring security in the north and creating a mechanism of negotiations to draw up a system of measures to reduce the military threat there in the context of M. Koivisto's well-known proposals and M.S. Gorbachev's Murmansk initiatives?

Answer: The Soviet Union has repeatedly advanced proposals, including in the United Nations, to curb the naval arms race. But every time we have encountered an unconstructive position from the United States and NATO. We have raised at the Stockholm conference the issue of confidence-building measures in the seas and oceans bordering our continent as well. But here, too, the stand of our partners from the opposing military alliance has remained negative.

And there is a problem, you know. It would be absurd to act in this way: to end the arms race with regard to some kinds of weapons and reduce them, while at the same time spurring on the arms race with regard to others—as though by way of "compensation." The logic is simple but flawed.

At the talks with the United States, we recently advanced a proposal to convene a special international conference on problems of reducing naval forces or, as a last resort, a UN Security Council session on this problem. We also believe that questions of naval activity must take a weighty share of the attention at the Third UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament and at the second stage of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

In this context, the north is a specific region. A tremendous potential for destruction belonging to both alliances is concentrated there. We well understand the concern expressed in President Mauno Koivisto's speech to the "Paasikivi" Society on 15 October 1986 and the concerns voiced by other northerners. We tried to take them into account when shaping the well-known Murmansk program. We are grateful for Finland's support of that program.

Question: Could you say what aspects of relations between Finland and the Soviet Union you consider important for the young people of our countries?

Answer: It is the task of our young people—both Finnish and Soviet—not only to preserve but also to enrich the innovative spirit which has been characteristic of Soviet-Finnish relations in recent decades. May they display these remarkable qualities to the full. In short, we must make sure that our relations continue to develop in the future in step with the times, or even rather ahead of them.

Other questions were also asked: In particular, about the possibility of cooperation between Finland and the Soviet Union on matters of conservation of the environment, on the influence of restructuring on the position of the church, about the prospects for the Soviet-U.S. summit, the problem of urbanization in today's world, cooperation in giving aid to developing countries, the influence of restructuring on international relations, the development of the twin town movement, cooperation in exploiting the riches of the Kola Peninsula, and others. The Finnish visitors received detailed and extensive answers to all the questions.

In conclusion, M. Miettunen warmly thanked Andrey Gromyko on behalf of the delegation for his substantive replies, for the meeting, and for the attention paid to the Finnish delegation in its trip around the Soviet Union.

Participating in the meeting on the Soviet side were: N.S. Konarev, USSR minister of railways and chairman of the Soviet-Finnish Friendship Society; Academician L.F. Ilichev, USSR deputy foreign minister; and E.L. Kuzmin, chief of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium International Relations Department. Aarno Karhilo, Finnish ambassador to the USSR, participated on the Finnish side.

Zubko Views Danish Action on Nuclear Port Calls

PM221449 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 3

[M. Zubko "International Commentary": "Antinuclear Resolution and U.S. Position"]

[Excerpts] The Danish parliament has just adopted a resolution which points out that the visits by ships carrying nuclear weapons to Danish ports are incompatible with the principles of the country's security policy. [passage omitted]

Thus the long struggle by broad strata of the Danish people against visits to the country's ports by ships carrying nuclear weapons is over. Or is it? All indications are that the losing side has no intention of giving up. P. Schluter, prime minister in the bourgeois cabinet, announced after an emergency government session that ministers will study the possible consequences of the parliamentary decision and the reaction of the NATO allies over the next 10 days and will then "adopt the requisite decision." What decision? It is, of course, difficult to tell as yet, but people in Denmark do not rule out the possibility that matters may culminate in early parliamentary elections. The point of this possible step is clear: The defeated parties will try to change the correlation of forces in the country's legislative organ and organize a second vote.

We shall see.... Meanwhile, let us draw attention to Washington's excessively stormy reaction. People there have stated that they are profoundly worried by the actions of the Danish parliament. Furthermore, official State Department Spokesman C. Redman has said that implementation of the resolution will undermine NATO policy and will have extremely serious consequences for U.S.-Danish cooperation in the defense sphere.

Let us pay particular attention to the words "will undermine policy" and "extremely serious consequences." In the course of the debate which has unfolded in the country, both Prime Minister P. Schluter and Foreign Minister U. Ellemann-Jensen have stated on several occasions that there is no need to adopt a law on ships carrying nuclear weapons since Denmark's NATO allies, including the United States, are well aware of the meaning of the Danish policy of the nonstationing of nuclear weapons in peacetime and that there is no reason to believe that they do not respect it.... But if the United States and NATO respect Denmark's antinuclear policy, this must mean that their ships carrying nuclear weapons do not call at the country's ports, so what has provoked such harsh assessments in Washington?

C. Redman, to justify the State Department position, said: "The United States has for a long time implemented a policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence of nuclear armaments on board ships." A convenient stance, isn't it? It is applied to many countries. The U.S. reaction prompts the thought that the Danish resolution is very inconvenient for the Americans, therefore... I do not want to write outright what this means. I only want to mention one historical episode: When a USAF strategic bomber carrying nuclear bombs crashed a little more than 20 years ago on the northern shores of Danish Greenland, it turned out that such aircraft were frequent visitors to the Thule Air Base on the shores of Greenland's "Northern Star" Gulf. This news came as a shock to all Danes....

NATO 'Frantic' To Block Decision

LD221558 Moscow TASS in English 1511 GMT 22 Apr 88

["NATO Bringing Pressure To Bear on Denmark"—TASS headline]

[Text] Copenhagen April 22 TASS—The resolution of the Social Democratic Party of Denmark, which has been passed by the Danish Folketing (parliament), for toughening rules on calls by foreign nuclear-capable ships at the country's ports has triggered off a general alarm in the NATO camp.

The leadership of the bloc is making frantic efforts for the document to take no effect.

Undisguised irritation with the "junior partner's" decision has been expressed first of all by the United States and Britain whose naval units come frequently to Danish shores.

As a response, they declared a possible limitation of the bloc's naval exercises with their participation in Denmark's territorial waters and called in question bilateral agreements in the field of defense.

The newspaper INFORMATION explains the frustration of the NATO leadership by the fact that allies have possibly been for decades violating the ban on the presence of nuclear weapons in Denmark in peacetime and that now Copenhagen is demanding that this should be stopped.

Another reason for NATO's strong criticisms is that the United States is trying to deal a blow at attempts to establish a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. This proposal has found ever broader support in the countries of the region.

The NATO Council at its emergency meeting in Brussels at permanent representative level to discuss the "Denmark crisis" has decided to move the session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group, slated to be held on April 27 and 28 at defense minister level, from the Danish city of Kolling to the Belgian capital.

It was another "sanction" in response to the Danish parliament's resolution.

The decision by outgoing NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington, who retires next July, to cancel his official farewell visit to Copenhagen next week is seen as yet another action directed against Denmark.

Speaking in an interview with the newspaper INFORMATION, Lasse Budtz, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Denmark's Commission for Security and Foreign Policy, condemned the "arms twisting" policy used by the United States with regard to Denmark.

He said that the others would have to get accustomed to the fact that Denmark was not Honduras and that the Danes were an independent Nordic nation with age-old traditions, which had the right to its own views and to their implementation.

Danish Campaign for Early Elections Assessed

PM250945 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yuriy Kuznetsov dispatch: "Why the Need for Elections"]

[Text] Copenhagen, 20 Apr—Denmark is once again heading in the direction of unscheduled parliamentary elections. Prime Minister Poul Schluter said Tuesday that after the government coalition's latest defeat in a Folketing vote on one of the most important aspects of its foreign policy, he could see no alternative other than to dissolve parliament and hold new elections. They are to be held 10 May.

The vote so inauspicious for the bourgeois coalition cabinet was its 23d defeat to date on "security policy" issues since 1982, when P. Schluter became head of a four-party government. Throughout this period the opposition—in which the main role is played by the Social Democrats—has been demanding a more clear-cut stand by Denmark on the question of nuclear weapons being stationed in its territory. On this occasion the Social Democratic Party, Socialist People's Party, and Radical Liberal Party secured the support of the majority of deputies when they demanded that foreign warships entering Danish ports be officially informed that Denmark does not permit nuclear weapons to be brought into its territory.

This demand would seem to fully accord with the officially stated principle of Danish foreign policy not to have these weapons on the country's territory in peacetime. However, as there has been ample opportunity to see, this declaration has not been backed by real measures that would really prevent the overt or covert presence of nuclear weapons or at least constitute a clear expression of disapproval. NATO warships, particularly American warships, including those equipped with nuclear weapons, have made use of Danish waters and harbors time and again, as if Copenhagen's official position can simply be ignored.

This situation has alarmed many Danes, and this alarm is reflected in the repeated resolutions which have been submitted to parliament. These resolutions picked up a majority vote there on the need to more decisively defend Denmark's sovereignty and insist on its fundamental policy being implemented in matters concerning nuclear weapons, even at the risk of arousing the displeasure of its main partners in NATO. The country has clearly reached the opinion that the unceremonious, bellicose course taken by the NATO partners is not only in violation of the principles of Danish foreign policy but also poses a direct threat to the vital interests of the Danish people.

It hardly needs to be said that the stubborn opposition from its own parliament has considerably irritated the ruling bourgeois coalition in Copenhagen. So now it intends to hold unscheduled parliamentary elections in an attempt to secure a correlation of forces in the Folketing more favorable to its own position. P. Schluter has said that it is now a question of Denmark's future in NATO and that its membership of this organization and, consequently, its defense by the bloc are under threat. The leading allies—the United States and Britain—expressed a similar opinion rather earlier, threatening Denmark with "great difficulties." London, in particular, has said that Britain will not take part in future maneuvers to rehearse Denmark's defense in the event of war. Washington has said that the Folketing's latest resolution undermines the "Western alliance's policy of nuclear deterrence." NATO General Secretary Carrington has said that the Danish parliament's decision could have "exceptionally serious" consequences for the entire North Atlantic bloc. An urgent conference of representatives of all NATO countries has been convened in Brussels to discuss the Folketing resolution.

The security adviser to the Danish prime minister has increased people's fears by saying that "the New Zealand example shows how the United States could possibly react to such action being taken by Denmark." The parallel with New Zealand carries many implications, although the Folketing resolution by no means goes as far as the decision taken by Wellington. NATO is clearly alarmed by the Danes' unquestionable desire for independence and also by their possible "bad example" for other small allies in NATO.

It must be said that the present Danish Government is not only trying to consolidate its positions in the foreign policy sphere. More than 6 months ago the four-party coalition lost 7 seats in the scheduled parliamentary elections and now has only 70 of the 179 seats in the Folketing. By making use of the NATO membership issue, on which the government is counting for securing the support of many voters, the bourgeois parties thereby also intend to free their hand to go ahead with their economic and social policies.

But the main point, of course, is that pro-NATO forces in Copenhagen have shown by their actions that they are prepared to make their own contribution to the policy of

essentially opposing the trend toward European detente and a reduction in the arms level. Their stand runs counter to the interests of present and future generations of the Danish people.

Visit by French Defense Research Group Official

PM251031 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Visit Over"]

[Text] Admiral Pierre Lacoste, president of the French National Defense Research Foundation, was in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation on 18-21 April.

Meetings and conversations took place with the representatives of the USSR Foreign Ministry and Defense Ministry, the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, academic institutes, the Military History Institute, and journalists.

Primakov Remarks on Roundtable With UK

PM221419 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[Special correspondent A. Lyutyy dispatch: "At Chatham House"]

[Text] London, 16 Apr—A Soviet-British "roundtable" attended by well-known scientists, politicians, and public figures was held over 3 days in the old London mansion of Chatham House, seat of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. This form of exchange of opinions on problems of bilateral relations and the most important questions of the international situation supplements the regular intergovernmental consultations and is an efficient means of deepening understanding of each other's positions. The standing organizers of these "roundtable" discussions are the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute. Officially instituted by the Soviet-British Government statement of 17 February 1975, "roundtable" discussions have been held annually, alternately in London and Moscow.

The participants in the latest discussion examined a wide range of questions from key military and political issues and regional conflicts to bilateral relations.

Here is the opinion of Admiral James Eberle, retired, cochairman of the "round table" and director of the Royal Institute of International Affairs:

"We discussed our hopes and fears in connection with various aspects of international relations. Regardless of existing differences, we invariably felt that we live on one planet. I must say that the very character of the discussions, which were fruitful, is a big step forward."

Academician Ye. Primakov, Soviet cochairman of the "round table" and director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute, said:

"We are satisfied with the meeting. Questions of great importance pertaining to the development of the international situation were discussed. Naturally, nuclear arms reduction problems were at the focus of attention. It was interesting for us to get to know the British attitude to these problems and to current talks and to clarify the likelihood of Great Britain joining in the general arms reduction process. We have also discussed the problem of conventional arms, whose solution is essential for the continuation of the disarmament process.

Cooperation between Soviet and British scientists is assuming ever new, useful forms. The Royal Institute of International Affairs and the World Economics and International Relations Institute have just published a joint study "International Economic Security."

U.S.-Greek Talks on Bases End Without Result

LD222214 Moscow TASS in English 1654 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Athens April 22 TASS—Correspondent Vladimir Malyshev writes:

The fifth round of Greco-American talks on the future of American military bases in Greece ended without result here today. No unanimity was achieved, journalists were told by a Greek Government spokesman. He added, however, that this did not mean that the talks were deadlocked. Their next round is to be held in Washington in May.

The agreement between Greece and the United States within the framework of which Washington has bases on Greek soil, expires late this year. The treaty provides that the U.S. military installations should be evacuated before it expires. Washington however stubbornly insists that they should stay and for this purpose increases pressure on the Greek Government. Mass actions by the residents of Athens were timed to coincide with the fifth round of the talks to press home demands that the talks with the United States be stopped and American bases removed from Greek territory.

Latin America & Caribbean

Zafesov Views U.S. 'Big Stick' Panama Policy

PM250959 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Second Edition p5

[Gennadiy Zafesov "Viewpoint" article: "There Will Not Be Any Laurels"]

[Text] The tension in Panama is increasing. I will say here and now that it is not so much a question of the rather complex domestic situation as one of external

factors. I am mainly thinking of the United States' stand on Panama. What kind of "antagonism" could there possibly be between the American colossus and a tiny country with more than modest potential?

For decades the Panama Canal linking the Atlantic and the Pacific has been a stumbling block. The Americans have always enjoyed the lion's share from its exploitation and discriminated against Panamanian employees. The Panamanians have fought for their rights and won them back literally inch by inch. The conclusion of the treaty signed in 1977 by U.S. President J. Carter and General O. Torrijos, an outstanding Panamanian leader, was an indubitable achievement. According to this treaty, by the year 2000 the canal must pass into the hands of Panama and will naturally come under its jurisdiction.

The Americans do not want to lose the canal, of course, but they have to reconcile themselves to this loss. But if there is one thing they certainly do not intend to lose, it is their military bases in the canal region. However, the Torrijos-Carter Treaty, as it is usually known in the Western Hemisphere, envisages exactly this.

The United States would very much like to revise this clause in the treaty. Initially it tried to achieve this aim through "quiet diplomacy." The Panamanian Government even received an unofficial proposal to hand the canal over to the Panamanians 10 years ahead of schedule. In exchange Panama would tolerate the American military presence "indefinitely." Quite strong nationalist, anti-American circles in Panama did not allow the country's sovereignty to become a bargaining counter.

American diplomats and members of the U.S. military then began to pay more frequent visits to Panama in the hope of finding some loophole. This also failed. Then they tried to galvanize openly reactionary forces within the country: They began to send them money, subversive literature, transmitters, and, finally, weapons. This, too, failed. They initiated an anti-Panama campaign in American political circles and the press. They even made a storm of demands to replace the Panamanian leadership. But the Panamanians stood firm.

It very much seems as if the United States has now resolved to resort to the most extreme of measures. It has begun to transfer military equipment and extra troops to the canal region. At the moment, they still number in hundreds, but we are not talking about numbers here. American warships are plying Panama's shores. A special headquarters has been established and placed on alert to direct U.S. troops in the event of hostilities breaking out in Panama. Their commander is Major General Bernard Loeffke, who is head of the U.S. Army Southern Command permanently stationed in Panama. We are receiving reports that new troop contingents are preparing to be dispatched to Panama. The increased military presence is already having a negative effect. At the Howard U.S. Air Force Base, guards exchanged fire with "unidentified persons" who had allegedly penetrated the base. Whether there was anyone there who should not have been has never been established. But it is a fact that one American Marine was shot by his own people. Eight Americans were injured in a collision between two military helicopters during an exercise at night.

The United States continues to wage an unprecedented offensive against Panama. THE WASHINGTON POST, for example, wrote that "the United States is coming close to military intervention in Panama in one form or another." It sometimes seems that some U.S. leading circles are beginning to lose their sense of reality and feel nostalgic for the times when the United States pursued a "big stick" policy in this region without a moment's hesitation.

Now would seem to be the time to recall that the old era is past. And if someone were to even think of reviving this era, it will not bring him any laurels.

Supreme Soviet Delegation on Caribbean Tour

Meets With Cuba's Aguirre

PM251101 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Interparliamentary Ties"]

[Text] Havana, 20 Apr—A delegation of Soviet parliamentarians headed by A.A. Mokanu, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is in the Caribbean on a goodwill mission, has held talks here with Severo Aguirre del Cristo, vice president of the National Assembly of the People's Government.

The talks, which were held in a warm, fraternal atmosphere, stressed the exceptional importance of the struggle to strengthen world peace and noted the complete unity of the two countries' views on this question. The head of the Soviet delegation dwelt in detail on the progress of restructuring in the USSR, which, as he stressed, has embraced all spheres of political, economic, and social life in the country. S. Aguirre del Cristo spoke about the process of rectifying errors and eliminating negative trends under way in Cuba, noted the successes achieved, and pointed out the important tasks facing the country.

The Soviet parliamentarians will be flying to Guyana today and will then visit Trinidad, Tobago, and Jamaica, where meetings will be held with representatives of the governments, parliaments, and public of those countries.

Talks With Guyanese President

PM251059 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Kamorin report under general heading "Interparliamentary Ties"]

[Text] Georgetown—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which is on a tour of several Caribbean countries, has arrived in Georgetown, capital of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana. This is the first visit by such a representative group of Soviet parliamentarians to the young state with which the USSR maintains traditional friendly relations.

The delegation was met at the international airport in the Guyanese capital by J. Thomas, one of the parliamentary leaders; USSR Ambassador to Guyana A.A. Ulanov; and other officials. Speaking at the ceremonial welcome, Soviet delegation head A.A. Mokanu, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, emphasized the important role of interparliamentary ties in strengthening mutual understanding between peoples and expressed confidence that bilateral ties between the USSR and Guyana will develop on a stable and mutually advantageous basis.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation was received by President H.D. Hoyt of Guyana.

Guyana Visit Summed Up

LD241052 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Georgetown April 24 TASS—A delegation of Soviet MPs, currently on a goodwill mission in the Caribbean, ended the official visit to Guyana. The delegation is led by Vice President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet A. Mokanu..

The Soviet guests were received by President of Guyana Hugh Desmond Hoyte, held talks with Prime Minister Hamilton Green, Foreign Minister Rashleigh Jackson, secretary general of the Ruling People's National Congress Party Ranji Chandisingh, Secretary General of the Opposition People's Progressive Party Chedli Jagan, other public and political leaders. At a meeting with their Guyanese counterparts the Soviet MPs briefed them on the activities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and current revolutionary transformations in the Soviet Union. The Soviet delegation also made a tour of Guyana.

Summing up the results of meetings and talks, Speaker of the National Assembly of Guyana Sase Narain expressed the hope that the visit of the Soviet Delegation to Guyana was a success, helped strengthen bilateral relations and marked the beginning of interparliamentary contacts between Guyana and the USSR. He stressed that both sides were building their relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence. On Soviet Union's foreign policy, Sase Narain said that Mikhail Gorbachev's impressive initiatives aimed at solving international issues were of great interest to Guyana and were the subject of repeated discussions during parliamentary sessions. The continued arms race, the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction pose a grave danger to human life. All-round security can be ensured only through the destruction of nuclear weapons and complete disarmament. Guyana, the speaker noted, expressed in this connection its firm support for the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of nuclear medium- and shorter-range missiles and hopes that it will mark the beginning of a process of genuine comprehensive disarmament.

The Soviet delegation held a news conference at the end of the visit. "From numerous meetings and conversations on Guyanian soil," Mokanu said, "We got an impression that the feelings of friendship and goodwill in relations between the two countries are growing stronger, that the Guyanian public wants to know more about the events in the Soviet Union. Taking into account the fact that the current international situation demands new political thinking and active involvement in the world processes of all countries and peoples without exception, the Soviet Union deems it necessary to establish closer ties with the Caribbean countries and peoples without exception, the Soviet Union deems it necessary to discuss with them the issues of peace, all-round security and development, which are of mutual interest. The head of the Soviet delegation said that the conversations also focused on the trade, economic and other relations between Guyana and the Soviet Union. He noted that the sides expressed an agreement in principle to develop them.

The Soviet delegation today left for Port-of-Spain, capital of the insular Caribbean state Trinidad and Tobago.

Arrives in Trinidad

LD241304 Moscow TASS in English 1222 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Georgetown April 24 TASS—The delegation of Soviet MPs currently on a tour of goodwill of the Caribbean countries has arrived in Port-of-Spain, the capital of Trinidad and Tobago today.

The Soviet MPs are to meet with President Noor Hassanali of Trinidad and Tobago, Prime Minister Arthur Robertson, MPs, familiarize themselves with the life of the population of that Caribbean island state.

The aim of our visit is an exchange of views on the key issues of the present with the leaders, political and public figures of Trinidad and Tobago, A.A. Mokanu, vice-president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said upon arrival. Our countries are united by their common wish for peace, for a further development of equitable and mutually beneficial cooperation in all fields. The head of the Soviet delegation expressed hope

that the contacts between the USSR and Trinidad and Tobago would be given an additional impetus in the interests of friendship and mutual understanding between the peoples of the two countries.

Cubans Lauded on Resistance at Bay of Pigs
PM221411 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 17 Apr 88 p 3

[O. Sidoruk article under the "International Notes" rubric: "In the Name of the Secret War"]

[Text] Operation "Pluto" began on the night of 16-17 April 1961. Approximately 1,500 mercenaries recruited and trained by the U.S. CIA landed on the coral reefs and coastal cliffs of the Bay of Pigs. A battalion quartered near the sugar plant barred the interventionists' path. Its fighters took the first blow. They were ready to fight to the last drop of blood in defense of the revolution. By morning the Cuban Government had transferred large forces and aircraft to the landing point at Playa Giron. The interventionists were smashed within 72 hours. The plot against Cuba thought up by the CIA and the Pentagon and implemented by the Cuban counterrevolutionary rabble had failed.

The armed intervention at Playa Giron is one of the culminating episodes in the secret war which the United States has been waging against Cuba for almost 30 years.

The Cuban Revolution which erupted in 1959 struck a blow at Washington's imperial interests. The point was not only that U.S. monopolies were deprived of a tasty morsel; the United States was much more alarmed by the fact that Cuba had shown all Latin America the way to rid itself of the fetters of U.S. neocolonialism. That is why the United States has for 30 years been applying desperate efforts in an attempt to put out the flame of the Cuban Revolution.

There is probably no means which Washington does not use in the struggle against the Island of Freedom. An unending chain of acts of economic sabotage and subversion has unwound since 1959. Sugar refineries, stores, and merchant ships have been blown up, bombs have been detonated on aircraft, and sugar cane plantations have been set on fire. The crimes were the work of Cuban counterrevolutionaries acting on the orders of the U.S espionage department.

On various occasions over the years, the CIA has carried out a series of terrorist acts against Cuban leaders, including a failed attempt on the lives of Fidel and Raul Castro. Professional assassins, mafiosi, were used for this. According to the testimony of the Cuban press, Fidel Castro is still even now the CIA's number one target.

In the seventies, the United States resorted to bacteriological warfare against the Island of Freedom. Outbreaks of diseases uncommon to this region among plants, agricultural livestock, and people were recorded in Cuba. The Cuban Government frequently made statements about the suspicious origin of these epidemics, which considerably damaged agriculture and caused deaths among the people. Thus, in the summer of 1981, more than 80 children died in Cuba from hemorrhagic dengue fever. A thorough investigation supported the assumption that the viruses were brought to the island by paid CIA agents.

U.S. presidents have changed, but the U.S. anti-Cuban course has remained unchanged. With the arrival of the "Reagan team" in the White House, Cuban-U.S. relations became even worse. The new administration based relations with the Republic on a hard line right down to "war against Castro." Provocative buzzing of Cuban territory by U.S. spy aircraft became more frequent. The propaganda war against Cuba has not known a single day's respite. U.S. leaders incessantly utter threats against the Republic. Military maneuvers are carried out around the island involving the landing of forces on the territory of the Guantanamo Naval Base, which the U.S. leadership illegally retains on Cuban territory. The CIA continues to send saboteurs to the island with enviable [as published] regularity. The secret war machine against Cuba is working on full power.

But the Cuban people resolutely oppose U.S. threats and provocation. "We can state categorically," Fidel Castro stressed in one of his speeches, "that Cuba may be wiped from the face of the earth, but it will never submit to intimidation and will never be defeated." Behind these words is the Cuban people's infinite devotion to the cause of the revolution and unbending determination and courage.

Political & Social

Moscow Hosts Lenin Anniversary Celebration

Leadership Appearances

LD222058 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1255 GMT on 22 April carries a 65-minute relay of a meeting held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses to honor the anniversary of Lenin's birth.

At 1259 GMT the leaders enter the hall in the following order: Zaykov, Gorbachev, Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Ligachev, Solomentsev, and others.

Those present in the hall applaud as the leaders take their places on the platform. They are seated in the following order, from left to right: front row—several unidentified figures, Pukhova, Slyunkov, Chebrikov, Ligachev, Gorbachev, Zaykov, Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, Vorotnikov, and several unidentified figures; second row—several unidentified figures, Shcherbina, Tolstykh, Kamentsev, Gusev, Voronin, Vedernikov, Belousov, Batalin, Antonov, Murakhovskiy, (aisle), Demichev, Maslyukov, Talyzin, Yazov, Dolgikh, vacant seat, (aisle), Baklanov, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Lukyanov, Medvedev, Kapitonov, (aisle), Voss, Ryutel, one unidentified figure, Shalayev, Orlov, Saykin, (aisle), Mesyats, Kulikov, Akhromeyev, Lizichev, and several unidentified figures. The third row is occupied by mostly unidentified figures, who also include Academician Fedoseyev, Nizovtseva, Afanasyev, Maksimov, Tretyak, Yefimov, and Chernavin.

At 1302 GMT the meeting is declared open by CPSU Politburo Candidate Member D.T. Yazov. Yazov then hands over to CPSU Politburo Candidate member G.P. Razumovskiy, who delivers a 52-minute report on the significance of Lenin's birthdate.

Gorbachev and Ligachev engage in conversation several times as Razumovskiy delivers his report.

Razumovskiy concludes his report at 1355 GMT. Zaykov declares the meeting closed and all rise for the Internationale. Gorbachev and Ligachev exchange some apparently friendly words during the applause following the Internationale.

The following people are sitting in the audience: Geydar Aliyevich Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee; Marshal of Aviation Kozhedub; Fleet Admiral Sorokin, USSR deputy minister of defense; and Army General Shkadov.

The relay concludes at 1400 GMT.

Razumovskiy Delivers Report

PM250938 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Apr 88 Second Edition pp 1-2

["Report by G.P. Razumovskiy at the Ceremonial Meeting To Mark the 118th Anniversary of V.I. Lenin's Birth" under the heading "For the Renewal of Socialism, for Leninism"]

[Text] Comrades, in the memory of peoples there are dates which are noteworthy for the whole of humanity. The date 22 April turns people toward the great thinker who, in word and deed, exerted a revolutionary effect on the fate of his own country and on the course of the world development: Vladimir Ilich Lenin.

For the Soviet people this date, the birthday of the leader of October, the founder of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, is especially dear. Time inevitably sets its imprint on each Lenin anniversary. So it is today. We are marking it in revolutionary conditions, when restructuring—the main concern of the party and people—has found wide scope and is affecting ever more deeply the interests of tens of millions of people. The scales and depth of the transformations under way in our huge country of many nationalities, its important position in today's world, the acuteness and complexity of the problems which have to be solved, oblige us to check the progress of restructuring against Lenin's thinking, to act by Lenin's will and consistency.

The greatness of the goals of restructuring is inseparable from the greatness of the feat achieved by the party and people. We already have the building of a new social organization, a powerful economic and intellectual potential, a rich and multifaceted culture, everything in which the life, energy, and talent of generations of the builders of socialism was invested. Soviet people do not conceive of their present or future outside socialism, outside the fundamental values inherent in it. The party is true to the revolutionary traditions of Bolshevism; it feels the support of the people and is confident of its strength and of the vitality of Marxist-Leninist teaching.

Restructuring has brought us closer to Lenin, and Lenin to us. Three years of struggle for an all-round renewal of our socialist society have shown that the theory and policy of restructuring, worked out by the party and understood and accepted by the people, are organically merged with the ideas and practice of Leninism.

These years have shown the party's ability to objectively evaluate the situation that has arisen, to draw from it the lessons essential to continue the revolution yet further. All of our experience teaches that it is necessary to read Lenin, to apply Lenin's art of political leadership each time, at each historical turn, in the context of the realities of the age, taking into account the dynamics of internal and international life. The CPSU considers it its duty to assert the revolutionarily critical, creative spirit of Leninism, to be equal to its historical responsibility.

In looking to Leninism, the party and the people draw from it their certainty of the necessity for the line of restructuring, and ideological and moral strength in the struggle for the ideals of socialism. Everything connected with Lenin is priceless—for the man, the thinker, the politician, the fighter. His party principledness and fearlessness as a revolutionary, his political honesty and personal modesty, were, and remain for us, a lofty example.

The Leninist Concept of Socialism in the Practice of Restructuring [subhead]

For Lenin serious politics began where the masses came into action. But the masses did not hide man from him. Man—his vital interests and hopes, his worth and happiness—were always at the center of politics for Lenin. The party regards this as the main political and moral legacy of Leninism, and aspires to follow it firmly and uncompromisingly in its own activity.

Comrades, since April 1985, which was a turning point for the fate of socialist construction, our country has been constantly moving in the process of renewal. Society is changing. We ourselves are changing. The more distinctly the immense meaning of the restructuring work that has started emerges, the more brightly the riches and fruitfulness of the Leninist conception of socialism stand before us, and the more insistent is the demand for a creative attitude to Lenin's theoretical and political legacy. Devotion to Leninism is measured not by the number of quotations. There was more than enough dogmatism in the past, but it only emasculated revolutionary theory. It is not for the sake of ritual that Soviet Communists turn again and again to the teachings of Lenin. We aspire to regenerate the Leninist face of the new system in today's conditions, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed in his speech to the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, to cleanse it of the layers of deformation, to free ourselves of everything that had been holding society down, and prevented it from realizing in full measure the potential of socialism, and, most importantly, to impart new qualities to socialist society taking into account all the realities of the contemporary world.

Such is the capacious formula embracing the revolutionary transforming essence of the present tasks of the party and people and their plans for the long term. Such is the direction of the political course of the CPSU.

More socialism today means more Leninism. It means fully reviving in theory and in practice Lenin's concept of socialism with its ideas of the live creativity of the masses; of a close alliance of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia; a diversity of forms of economic, social, and spiritual life. It means strengthening and developing a new structure as Lenin taught—not by enthusiasm directly, but with the aid of enthusiasm born of the Great Revolution, through personal interest, through personal commitment, and economic accountability. Historical practice has shown that attempts artificially to straigthen the road mapped out by Lenin and skip stages, have slowed down and seriously complicated the development of socialism, impoverished it. The party resolutely rejects dogmatic, voluntaristic, bureaucratic distortions of Lenin's ideas. Only uneroded, undevalued socialist principles can act as reliable reference points in the work of restructuring.

Yes, following Lenin, the party bases itself on the fact that socialism reveals its progressive nature only on the most front-ranking basis of production and technology. Today this assumes a cardinal turn in the production forces of the country on the basis of the latest achievements of science and technology, a decisive transition from the extensive to the intensive road of development.

Yes, as Lenin indeed foresaw, public ownership of the means of production remains the supporting structure of the economic system of socialism, but this has to be cleansed of accretions of the mentality that it belongs to no one, the alienation of the workers from it. A flexible economic mechanism has to be put in motion linking the national collective, and personal interest, and consistent implementation of the principle of social justice inherent in our society has to be ensured.

Yes, it is the aim of a socialist state, as Lenin considered, to be an effective instrument of the construction of the new society.

But such can only be a state that is based on the real sovereignty of local soviets, true democracy, and the broad participation of the working people themselves in state and public affairs, and that is free from bureaucratic distortions. Lenin's principles for a nationalities policy also remain today a reliable compass for the nationalities question, which is one of the most difficult and delicate. Conducting in a Leninist way an attentive nationalities policy, formulated on the basis of a well-considered analysis and accurate appraisals, means taking account, as fully as possible, of the interests of each nation and of the country as a whole, and strengthening the fraternal friendship and the internationalist unity of all the peoples of the USSR. According to Lenin's thinking, the complete establishment of socialism requires a high level of culture and civilization, and restructuring must ensure that the cultural stratum of socialism becomes increasingly powerful and fruitful. We follow Lenin in thinking that socialism is humanism. A new system is supposed to accomplish its destiny in practice, to ennoble man, and restructuring focuses on man, his well-being, his cares, his work, and his life.

In this way, comrades, Lenin's thoughts and ideas provide the starting points for restructuring. The party today is concentrating on them the attention of the working people and of Communists. They help us to work out a new approach, and we use them to measure our successes and difficulties.

The main political result of the work carried out since April is that the party and the people have taken a decisive step away from the precrisis boundary that society was facing in the early eighties, and that positive tendencies are gaining strength in the development of the country as a whole. That is obvious to anyone who thinks objectively and is unprejudiced.

Restructuring is breaking up the underlying strata of life and is stimulating the people's energy. People are emerging from their state of social apathy, are straightening themselves up morally, and are aware of their civic dignity. A new social atmosphere is asserting itself—an atmosphere of glasnost, free discussion of urgent issues, exactingness, and rejection of all ostentation and psychological duality. A growing awareness of everyone's responsibility for the affairs of society, at the enterprise and within the collective, is raising the tone of working and political life. It also became apparent on the day of the Leninist communist subbotnik. Processes of fundamental importance are taking place in the field of material production. Our economy is starting to grow on a healthy foundation. Expansion of the volume of production has begun to be sustained almost entirely by increased labor productivity. In industry, during the first 2 years of the 5-year plan period, the average annual rate of growth reached 4.4 percent, as opposed to 3.7 percent duringt he last 5-year plan period.

The prime cost of output is sinking 2.5 times more quickly, and agriculture is developing more firmly: grain harvests and production of meat and milk have risen. The assets of restructuring include the start of a real turnabout in the economy toward satisfying people's everyday needs and requirements and overcoming whatever-is-leftover principle in making provision for the social sphere. Capital investment in its development has exceeded by more than 10 percent the level initially planned, and the rate of its investment growth was 3 times higher than for the whole national economy. The commissioning of housing has grown significantly: 4.4 million apartments have been built in the last 2 years, which has made it possible to improve living conditions for almost 22 million people.

There are achievements, as you can see, but there are no grounds to overrate them or, even less, to close one's eyes to the problems which restructuring is facing. Of course, more could have been done. The implementation of major programs directed at the technical reconstruction of the national economy is still proceeding very slowly; there are a number of difficulties in realizing progressive structural improvements in the economy and in developing savings of resources, increasing the technical standard and quality of production, and raising the output-capital ratio. Forward movement in these strategic areas is still not proceeding as it needs to. These are large-scale, long-term tasks, and their fulfilment requires the greatest possible exertion of all the forces of society, high discipline and organization, and the initiative of each worker. In general, it is necessary to do more work and more must be done by everybody, without exception.

Restructuring is a labor and a struggle, a struggle for the future of socialism, against the inertia of its own past, and against that which pulls us back. The principal springboard for this struggle in its new stage upon which we have embarked is the resolution of two interrelated tasks: the radical economic reform and the democratization of the life of society and the party. Economic reform is an indispensable aspect of the renewal of socialism and of giving it advanced democratic forms. In its turn, it is impossible to bring the people into restructuring without democratization, and appeals to intensify the human factor will remain abstract. The rate of our movement forward in all spheres depends today on the linkage and mutual strengthening of these two processes.

The goal which has been set is concrete: to ensure in the forthcoming years a transition from an excessively centralized command system of management to a democratic one, based principally on economically efficient methods and on the optimum combination of centralism and self-management. The reform means a sharp extension of the rights and independence of enterprises. Mastering a new planning procedure, changing the organizational structures of management, improving the pricing system, bringing about a recovery in finances, and going over to wholesale trade in the means of production are among the key tasks of the moment. However, people must not wait until all problems are solved at the various levels of management, either. In the final analysis, success is brought about by the labor collectives themselves.

Without their active inclusion in restructuring, economic reform simply cannot be realized. Initial experience convinces us that things are bogged down in those places where they are trying to bring about transformation by means of decrees from the apparatus, as if over the heads of the labor collective, without reference to the economic discernment and material interests of the workers. Yet if the bottom links are passive, the principles of financial autonomy, self-recoupment, self-financing, and self-management—the main motors of the new economic mechanism—cannot come into play. The interests of the matter demand that the strategy of economic restructuring should be implemented by a tactic whereby the costs of dismantling the retarding mechanism and changing over to new conditions would be minimal. It is the collectives and workers who work better and more efficiently who should feel the improvements soonest.

The orientation toward diversifying the forms of socialist management is a most important aspect of the economic transformations. We have had and still have a unified socialist economic system. By acquiring diversity, it will get more flexibility and more stability, and thus it will become better able to satisfy the demands of consumers. This is the idea of the revival of the cooperative movement and the development of cooperative organizations as equal partners with state enterprises,

and the introduction of cooperative principles into various fields of economic life. The development of individual forms of labor activity is also in the interests of the economy and meets the needs of society.

All efforts to develop the economy are in the last resort subordinate to the main thing: to make the life of people better and more rewarding and to make it so now, not in some far off future. Constant efforts are needed today, persistent hard work from all in order to ensure the real satisfaction of the demands of the people for food, housing, goods and services, in order in the soonest possible time to achieve a fundamental breakthrough in health care and public education.

Decisions on this matter have been taken at state level and changes for the better have appeared on the scale of the whole country. They have been noted among the people, but it is impossible not to be concerned at the unjustified diversity of the picture. In those areas where an upsurge in the economy is being aimed at effectively, subsidiary farms and collective farm markets are being developed, and initiatives in expanding services and in constructing individual and cooperative housing are being encouraged. In other words, where they are truly showing concern for people's needs, changes are making themselves felt. But where they are continuing to wait passively for something to come down from above, and are not mobilizing the existing reserves, the results are scanty.

No one has the right today to stand aloof from social issues: neither central bodies, nor local ones, nor labor collectives. A characteristic feature of modern days is that the social and political activeness of working people is being awakened. This is a vital source of that energy which feeds the democratic process. Soviet society today needs democracy in its effective and strong manifestations. It needs glasnost, criticism and self-criticism, appointment by election, working people taking an actual part in management and supervision. Then the policy of renewal will be taken on, picked up, and reinforced through reciprocal efforts on the part of the millions. It is not superficial democratization that the party has in mind as its guiding principle, but democratization affecting the fundamental structures of society and development of its political system. The key issue here is the need to radically enhance the role of soviets of people's deputies and provide them with full power, as a political foundation of our socialist state. It is the soviets, looking directly for their support to the masses, which must take part actively in all the transformations, act as authoritative and energetic bodies of people's self-management, and combat consistently poor department coordination which was described by Lenin as a major evil hampering economic construction. They are responsible for tackling issues involving labor, living conditions, and leisure of the population in a coordinated fashion. Soviets may use initiative in contributing to spreading all the front-ranking ideas of economic management, cultural construction, and improving our way of life.

Only a mechanism of power and management that from top to bottom is subordinate to the people corresponds to the goals of renewal. In other words, one that is formed democratically and perfected through developing principles of self-management, and that rules out subjectivism in tackling state issues, any disparaging attitude to public opinion or people's interests. This is the direction in which the work aimed at organizing the management apparatus is being channeled. The task of this work is to impart to it modern efficient forms, to liberate it from its unwieldy shape and stagnation, while pushing inquiring and competent people into the foreground. It is important to work for the situation in which the old routine cannot be revived in some new guise, and in which as a result of the restructuring that is under way the apparatus also changes qualitatively and starts working creatively, with ideas of restructuring pervading its life.

Genuine democratization can and should be taking place on the basis of strengthening the rule of law, observance of laws everywhere, and inevitability of being punished for violating them. Neither should provision of a legal framework for restructuring lag behind, for this would play into the hands of the adherents of high-handed administrative meddling, leaving loopholes for legal nihilism, for antidemocratic sorties of irresponsible elements which make the population indignant. The rule of law, law and order, must continue to be strengthened. Legislation must continue to be improved further. A universal legal education for the population must continue to be organized, for without this a socialist state which accepts the rule of law is unthinkable.

The party welcomes the growth and variety in the forms of spontaneous social activities which make it possible for people to express the entire gamut of their interests and requirements. The appearance of new associations, including the so-called informal ones, bears witness to the dissatisfaction with the way in which numerous social institutions work, with the content and methods of their activities.

The trade unions and the Komsomol, as well as other mass public organizations, artistic unions, and voluntary societies are called upon to take into account and give expression, as full as possible, to the interests of all strata of the population, putting them into the service of social progress.

After all, the dynamism of the nationwide movement for restructuring depends on the scope of the people's social creativity. The party does not conceive of changes without trade unions taking a most active part in them. They represent a mighty social force, called upon to increase its contribution to implementing the economic reform and social programs and to organizing the entire life of labor collectives.

The place of the young generation in society's renewal deserves to be singled out. Already now, restructuring is, to a considerable extent, a cause of young people, and it is perfectly clear that their role will, in future, be immeasurably greater. In these conditions, the Leninist Komsomol's responsibility for the upbringing of young men and women is growing. New opportunities are being created for the Komsomol to show itself as a genuine political leader of the youth movement, to involve young people more broadly in restructuring, in the democratic processes, and to protect their interests. This also is a concern of ours, of the older generation, and a concern of the party.

Accomplishment of all we have drawn up depends on the society and each Soviet man becoming conscious of what, it seems, is a simple truth: It is necessary to learn to work wholeheartedly, with initiative and competence as befits citizens of a great state.

Mastering the Leninist Art of Political Leadership [subhead]

Comrades, Vladimir Ilich Lenin loved the simile that the revolution is like the locomotive of history. To drive the locomotive at high speed while keeping it on the rails—that is how he saw the art of political leadership during critical times. To march at the head of the masses, to develop the activity of the people, to direct it accurately toward achieving the aims of the revolution—that is how Vladimir Ilich saw the destiny of the party.

Today the Communist Party also marches at the head of the revolutionary renewal of society. It is precisely the CPSU which voiced the demand which had come to a head in society and on its own initiative began the process of all-embracing changes in the country. The party sees its guiding role as being to move the transformations onward at an accelerated pace, to develop the potential of socialism, and to put it into the service of man. The party is the soul of restructuring, the guarantor of the continuity of the great Leninist cause. It is the one force common to the whole people and to all the nationalities which ensures the cohesion of all the nationalities and ethnic groups of the USSR in a single mighty state.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin did not recognize anything automatic in asserting the leading role and prestige of the Communist vanguard in society. He considered that the vanguard role of the party, no matter how glorious a history it had behind it, was derived from its policy, its links with the masses, its style and method of activity, and from the latter's results. If the party in any way lags behind the dynamics of transformation or behind the mood of the masses, this is very liable to lead to serious omissions in forming the social consciousness and to disruptions in the rhythm of creative work.

The lessons of Lenin's political skill are not just a matter of history. They are still alive today. They remind us that it is essential constantly to master the art of leadership and that the renewal of society naturally requires the renewal of the party, too, and a renewal which is a serious one, a considerable one, one in which it is necessary, as Lenin put it, to refashion the very type of party work. The task which is now coming to the forefront for party organizations is to learn to operate in conditions of increasing activity in society, to approach all issues from political positions, and to resolve them by political means. For party committees to be up to these tasks means to be a genuine headquarters of restructuring and to draw all Communists into the work.

Politically verified actions presuppose that situations and processes are given profound and timely study, account is taken of public opinion, and all attempts to smooth over the acuteness of problems are repudiated. Then it is possible precisely to see and understand what is going on in society, to have mastery of events, and to prevent them from developing in a negative way. Getting out of the office, maintaining constant contacts, and consulting with people knowing their needs and demands and knowing how to gather in their experience—herein is the most interesting and most necessary side of party work.

Glasnost, democracy, openness, and respectful attention to the opinion of Communists and of nonparty people enable the party policy to be yoked more firmly with the interests of the masses than the most wise directives. When people can judge trustworthily, not merely by hearsay, on the work of this or that party committee, then their confidence in it increases, they will without fail come with advice and critical comments, and they will suggest where forces should be directed.

Communists' realization of the need for changes is also shattering the stagnation in the sphere of party activity. The organizational influence of plena of party committees and meetings of Communists is growing; ostentation has been squeezed out, criticism is becoming more to the point, party glasnost is developing, and discipline is becoming stronger. In party organizations, Communists are intolerant of formalism and incompetent leadership. The report-backs by the elective organs about management of restructuring were a major step in the democratization of the party itself and in further improving the work of its organizations. These were held for the first time on a party-wide scale simultaneously, and in an atmosphere such as made it possible to bring to light both the strong and the weak sides of the elective organs, their leaders, and the apparati of party committees.

Discussion has shown that Communists are profoundly concerned by the progress of restructuring. Their desire to understand everything is great. Evaluations of the state of affairs have become closer to the realities. Many valuable suggestions and critical comments have been expressed. All this has undoubtedly enlived party life.

The open and self-critical discussion has thrown into relief the general need to reestablish in full the Leninist principles of party leadership. Communists are becoming convinced that one cannot count upon people's support, if democracy and glasnost are measured out in doses, methods based upon issuing commands and orders are adhered to, paper-pushing and holding of endless meetings continue and if local soviet and economic organs and social organizations are encroached on.

Following the 27th congress, the democratic content of its directives on intraparty matters met with a profound response among the mass of Communists and nonparty people. The striving to apply the Leninist theses and norms of party life, rejecting any attempts to reinterpret them in a self-interested way, is growing stronger. Unfortunately, there are still people in the party environment who are infected with great-leaderism [vozhdism], practicing the cult of office, who are striving to preserve both absence of checks on leaders and indifference of those led. For a CPSU member living according to the party rules means maintaining in every organization an atmosphere of genuine party comradeship, in which a Communist can express his point of view without obstacle, defend it freely, and demand a response to criticism which is to the point.

In forming their attitude to restructuring, working people look closely at the party members who live and work beside them; they weigh up their stand, their behavior, and moral aspects, and their personal contribution to the collective's common labor. If they see before them an idler, a time-server, a careerist, a self-seeker, or a man of empty words with a party card, then it is easy to comprehend the damage done to the party. Hence our implacability toward any deviations from party discipline and morals, and the increasing demands on those who are entering the ranks of the CPSU. To raise the name and the significance of CPSU member ever higher—herein lies the party's responsibility to the people. Wherever he works, whatever post he occupies, the Communist is a kind of ambassador for the party, obliged to be a fighter for its line and to influence people. Today, prestige within the collective and the respect of those around one come to the person who courageously stands up for the new in words and by personal example, who takes upon himself the most difficult burden in work, who does not hide in the shadows when there is an actual clash of standpoints, and who fearlessly enters debate and argument if the party point of view is being distorted, if the cause is suffering, or if an injustice is being committed. It is such Communists who make the CPSU strong. The people follow those Communists for whom active participation in restructuring has become the thing that gives life meaning, a matter of personal honor and personal dignity.

The growth of the party's influence on social processes depends directly on cadres policy. The basic demands of this policy as applicable to today's conditions were formulated by the CPSU Central Committee January 1987 Plenum. Many new, capable comrades, who have embarked on matters to hand with energy, have been placed in leading posts of late.

The party is seeking to have arbitrariness and a bureaucratic approach consistently eliminated from cadre work, to purposely get rid of situations where the decisive role in promotion to leading posts is played by questionnaire, connections, or protection. This is making the work of cadres more open, and it is creating a space for the competition of minds, talents, and skills. The first experience in restructuring has confirmed that a correct approach to the cadre policy is possible only in conditions of consistent democracy, when the decisive voice in selecting and promoting cadres belongs to the masses, when it becomes the norm that leaders, including party ones, should be elected by a wide group, on the basis of genuine competition, and their regular accountability to both workers and Communists. To do everything to ensure that it is the people with the greatest prestige, devoted to the ideas of restructuring, and with a real personality who get into the leadership—this is the aim of the further democratization of cadre work.

The party's position on cadre questions has been expressed clearly and unambiguously. Everyone who accepts its ideas in his heart, and who honestly overcomes and rids his thought and style of work of everything not in harmony with the spirit of the time, and who is a bearer of new things and toils conscientiously, such a person has the prospect and the moral right to remain a leader. In the contrary case, he should yield his place. This was said once again without beating about the bush at the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum. A correct cadre policy is one of the guarantees that the policy toward democratization and renewal will be conducted decisively and without hesitation.

Preparations are actively underway in the country for the 19th all-union party conference. It will analyze the course of fulfilling the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, draw up the results of the first half of the 5-year plan period and examine the further democratization of the life of the party and society. Socialist competition to welcome the conference is widely underway. In the mass media and at numerous gatherings and meetings, people are coming out actively in favor of deepening the process of democratization, and they are making proposals which they consider deserve the attention of the party forum. A profound analysis and consideration of all that is being said will allow the party to come to the conference enriched by the people's experience of restructuring, by knowledge of their problems and the mood of the workers.

From the Standpoint of the Ideology of Renewal [subhead]

One of the most significant but not easily assimilated lessons of the history of constructing a new society is that each decision, each practical act, must be subjected to strict examination for its conformity with the essence and aims of socialism formulated in the classics of Marxism-Leninism. This lesson is of particular importance at present, when the party must show courage and rid itself of those notions of socialism which bear the stamp of certain conditions and, especially, of the period of the personality cult.

This has to be done in a complex situation, marked by contradictions. On the one hand, the mass basis of the renewal processes is expanding, the alliance of society's forces which come out for restructuring is gaining in strength—and this a powerful factor, facilitating our movement forward. On the other hand, many have so far proved unable to come to terms psychologically with the new situation; not everybody has managed—and some do not wish—to get involved in the common work, and this represents a substantial brake, holding restructuring back. This is why the ideology of renewal assumes such a resounding political dimension. It helps each Communist and each Soviet person to understand clearly the choice which has been made by the country, and to understand that the revolutionary achievements of the people can be maintained, developed,and .multiplied only along the path of restructuring, and that any other approach will take society back to the past.

At the 27th CPSU Congress a harmonious system of views of the world at the end of the 20th century was put forward, a world contradictory but interdependent, multifaceted but becoming more and more integrated. Socialism is the part of that world to which—and we are firmly convinced of this—the future belongs. The ideology of renewal represents a development and enrichment of Leninist views of socialism and its historic mission in radically changed conditions. It is precisely on the basis of new political thinking that the CPSU is leading the processes of forming a socialist consciousness, seeking to make the true Leninist ideals of socialism and peace ones that are held by the whole Soviet people. It is precisely against the background of that point of view that the CPSU is examining the problems of developing the personality and creating the new man: a master, creator, patriot and internationalist, a worthy citizen of socialist society, a person capable of answering for his actions, of evaluating and interpreting them critically and of measuring them against the political and moral goals of restructuring.

The fate of restructuring and thus the fate of the country and of socialism depend on a restructuring of thinking among Communists and all working people. But this is just one aspect of the matter, comrades. It is only by taking a practical part in activity to effect transformations that people become in full measure the dramatis personae of history, begin to understand the deep-seated objectives of the social process, and find the elevated meaning of life.

The struggle for socialist consciousness means overcoming antirestructuring views and attitudes, stereotypes of the old way of thinking. It means breaking with backward-looking views, breaking with them in such a way as to promote the consolidation of society around party policy. The CPSU calls upon everyone to take the platform of socialist renewal. It sees its task in strengthening a real and conscious moral and political unity of society on the principles of restructuring, by defending and implementing its strategic line.

Unity in the main does not mean artificial leveling out of opinions. It presupposes a diversity of opinions on specific issues and many options for resolving this or that problem. This is how it should be in every healthy collective and in society as a whole. Differences in points of view, quests, and disputes—when there is agreement on the fundamental issues—are not an obstacle to unity, but rather the condition for strengthening unity.

Democracy and glasnost undermine bureaucratism and conservatism, but not socialism at all. They only add to the strength of the socialist order.

Certain people, however, just cannot assimilate this, and they strive to present difficulties as the result of restructuring, they condemn excessive democratization and glasnost, and they confuse them with anarchism and an undermining of foundations. This stance is not just politically untenable, but it becomes in practice an obstacle to restructuring. For instance, in some places people try to curcumvent the law on enterprises; in others they put a clamp on someone who is sensible, restless, and therefore inconvient to certain people; in others still they put pressure on those who want to work more and thus earn more, and in some places there are direct attacks on restructuring under the guise of a defense of principles. In essence, what is involved is resistance from conservative forces dissatisfied with restructuring.

It happens that this derives, in Lenin's phrase, from the most dusty corners of our state apparatus. Behind this dissatisfaction lies an interest, but it is a mercenary-minded interest, dictated by fear of changes which are destroying a stagnant way of life and depriving some of undeserved official perks and others of unearned incomes. Both categories fall in with restructuring, but they only mimic forward movement, while in fact pedaling in the opposite direction. It is they who sow a lack of faith in the realism of the tasks set by the party, and this is further grounds for being more active in working with people and elucidating the sources of current problems and the goals and essence of restructuring.

The party initiated the sober interpretation of the country's post-October history not least because many of the misfortunes of today were brought about by yesterday's deviations from the political, economic and moral principles of socialism. Teaching the truth about history is no simple task. It stings many people to the quick, and

there are some who, in general, have no wish for an honest talk about the past. We are learning to see the achievements and the errors in the correct light, and to objectively assess the contribution toward building the new society by all the Soviet generations and their outstanding representatives. The reputation has been restored of many Communists who played an active part in the revolution and the struggle for socialism. The artistic and scholarly works of figures in our multinational culture and science, undeservedly consigned to oblivion, are being returned to the people. This work helps to clear the way to the future. The CPSU intends to continue it without passing over anything in silence or sweeting the truth, no matter how bitter it might be.

Needless to say, attempts to enlist history as an ally against the present for the purpose of defending what life has already rejected, whether this affects the field of politics, ideology, culture, or relations between the nationalities, are unacceptable. People today want to thoroughly understand all that restructuring has to offer, and what it requires from the individual and from the whole of society. The method of persuasion is, therefore, the principal and most effective means of uniting the people. Its use presupposes a high level of political education on the part of those carrying out that work, as well as an impeccable sense of democracy in dealings with the masses. Persuading means maintaining a respectful dialogue with people, avoiding a commanding and peremptory tone, and relying on the force of argument. It means making a serious study of the skills of polemics. It is no use whatsoever substituting label-sticking for the defense of one's own standpoint, or mere declaration for the proof of one's case.

We consider the whole world around us, and not just ourselves alone, from the standpoint of the ideology of renewal. The new thinking organically links the problems and prospects of socialism in our country with the problems and prospects of the development of mankind. The ideas of the prenuclear age are alien to the new thinking. It opposes the imperialist concepts of hegemonism and total confrontation, enmity and intolerance, with appeals for partnership and cooperation between all states in order to settle global questions—first and foremost, the questions of war and peace—for the respecting of each people's right to freely choose their path of development, and for the establishment of civilized relations between all countries.

Socialism and peace are inseparable. Our class interests completely coincide with what at present are the priority interests of the whole of mankind, its desire to preserve life on earth. The party sees its main internationalist duty in moving successfully along the path of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Our country's influence on world development is to a significant measure determined by its economic potential and depends on our skill and ability to prove the new system's superiority by deed, by example.

The 3 years of restructuring, democratization, and openness [otkrytost] in our internal and foreign policies and in our public life have considerably changed the notions about the Soviet Union abroad, facilitating the destruction of numerous anticommunist prejudices. The prestige and influence of our country in the international arena and of the ideas and practice of socialism have been enhanced.

The ideology of renewal determines the nature, content, and goals of the party's innovative, dynamic international course which is based on the Leninist approach. It is precisely Lenin who is the author of those fundamental ideas that have become the seminal ideas in the elaboration of a new political thinking.

The Leninist analysis of the leading trend of world development, toward an ever closer intertwining of the destinies of peoples and states in the conditions of a dynamic progress of science and technology and the growth of the role global problems play in mankind's life has been confirmed.

Lenin foresaw that the perfecting of weaponry would become a threat of universal disaster for our planet and that it would overturn the traditional concept of war. The conclusions formulated in the Central Committee's political report to the 27th Congress and in other party documents represent a logical continuation and development of the Leninist analysis of the world in the contemporary era.

The new political thinking is not an abstract scheme. It is being embodied ever more fully in the party's international policy. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement of 15 January 1986 in which the principles of a nuclear-free and violence-free world and the methods of attaining this goal are set out was a powerful political and moral factor, facilitating fundamental change for the better on the international arena.

From disarmament negotiations the international community is going over to the practice of limiting the arms race and reducing military arsenals. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the prospects for concluding an agreement on a 50-percent reduction of the strategic offensive arms with the ABM Treaty being strictly observed are testimony to the fact that the Soviet program of ridding ourselves of mass destruction weapons is realistic.

The signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan has also become a weighty proof of the constructiveness of the policy in the spirit of the new thinking.

Our country is part of the multifarious community of socialist states, each of which, finding support in cooperation and joint action, determines for itself the paths of its development and organically combines initiative with the common agreed line in foreign policy. Their

approach to world affairs demonstrates that it is socialism which should and can become the real pioneer in the humanization of international relations, and that its highest aim is the person. Asserting a broad and open view of the world in which we live and which we must preserve for future generations is an important area of the party's work in forming the socialist awareness of the Soviet man. Such an approach expresses the very essence of the new thinking, in which a new role for values which mankind has in common is a central link.

Our society is experiencing a period of ideological, political, and moral upsurge. The Communist Party sees its task in unifying its forces and those of the masses and directing this unified might into implementation of the program of radical transformations of our society, into prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, and into construction of an all-embracing system of international security. The ideology of socialist renewal helps to tackle this strategic task, rallying the Soviet people around the ideas of restructuring, the ideas of Leninism.

Comrades, a person who truly deserves the name of political figure never dies as far as politics is concerned. This thought of Lenin's can be applied to Lenin himself with every justification. He was at the fount of the mighty social processes and was the organizer of the political forces which have in the 20th century transformed and continue to change the face both of our country and of the whole world.

And his revolutionary biography is not over yet: History daily fills out Lenin's political portrait. It has fallen to us to continue and to develop the tasks begun by Lenin which face us, vast, truly revolutionary and thus very difficult tasks. But, as Lenin stressed, difficulty is not unrealizability. It is important to have confidence that the right path has been chosen, and this confidence increases a hundredfold the revolutionary energy and revolutionary enthusiasm that are capable of working wonders. As the heirs of Lenin's cause, we say today that nothing will shake our confidence that the path we have chosen is correct.

Yes, comrades, what the party and people have achieved in 3 years of restructuring is just the beginning, but it is a beginning which opens up the prospect of a revival of socialism's Leninist face and of Soviet society's ascent to a qualitatively new level of its development.

Public Celebrations Described

LD222025 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—The Soviet people festively observed today the 118th anniversary of the birth of Lenin, the founder of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

This April day conicided with the spring of social renewal, perestroyka and openness. Perhaps never before has it been so important for the Soviet people to acquire Lenin's ability to deal with the most acute and complex matters. Perhaps never before have they turned so often and with such attention to Lenin's political legacy, to his personality.

There were many people in Red Square today. The Lenin Mausoleum was visited by leading officials of Moscow, representatives of Moscow's public. Wreaths were placed at the mausoleum of the great leader.

A celebration meeting was held in the Kremlin in the evening. Alternate Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the Central Committee Georgiy Razumovskiy delivered a report. He noted in his report that "the CPSU is loyal to the revolutionary traditions of Bolshevism, feels the support of the people, is confident of its own strength, of the viability of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. Perestroyka brought us closer to Lenin and brought Lenin closer to us."

A show of films devoted to the life and activity of the leader of the October Revolution started in cinema houses of the capital today. Films about Lenin's associates are shown. School children were accepted into the Young Pioneer Organisation in a ceremony in the Central Lenin Museum. New exhibits were added to the exposition in the museum on the eve of the leader's birth anniversary. An interesting exhibition was prepared by the museum's researchers jointly with their colleagues from Prague and Bratislava. The exposition contains some 300 volumes of Lenin's works in the Czech language.

The so far unknown telegrams by Lenin sent from Moscow to Petrograd in 1921 were discovered by members of staff of the Central Archives of the October Revolution and Socialist Construction in Leningrad. There are 258 places in Leningrad that are associated with Lenin. Each of these memorials is marked these days by a commemorative sign with lines from documentary chronicles.

Days of international solidarity are now held all over the country. Their participants were guests of school children and students in Lenin's native city, Ulyanovsk.

Zaykov Lays Wreath

LD230158 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 22 Apr 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] People are coming to Red Square, to Lenin, in an endless stream. Marking this date, which is dear to all of us, we express our respect and love for the man, thinker, and revolutionary, for he inspired October and created our party and state.

Today Comrade Zaykov, members and candidate members of the Bureau of the Moscow City and Oblast party committees, and leaders of the Moscow City Council and

the Moscow Oblast Council visited Lenin's tomb. Wreaths were laid at Vladimir Ilich Lenin's tomb on behalf of the city and oblast party committees and the city and oblast soviets. [video shows Zaykov and other officials laying wreaths, bowing to the tomb, and walking in]

Stalin's Undermining of Lenin's Ideas Recalled

PM221401 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 21 Apr 88 p 1

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences V. Polikarpov under the "Topical Theme" rubric: "Reading Lenin Today"—boldface as published]

[Text] Society's return to the ideas of Lenin, to a scientific, honest, and sober understanding of its true interests, has been understood by the party—the political and moral leader of restructuring—as the key task of revolutionary transformation. Without a return to Leninist stances, without practical assimilation of Leninist experience of the struggle for socialism and democracy, it is impossible to destroy the administrative system that is now openly opposing the will of the people and party and feverishly mobilizing its forces and cadres to bring restructuring to its "Stalingrad."

The revival of Leninism and the full restoration of the Leninist concept of socialism and the ways of building—this task confronts us with unprecedented acuteness. We learned long ago that the great revolutionary theory is a guide to action. But for a while, little thought was given to the consequences that deviations from it threaten.

When it was said over and over again that the people owed all victories to Stalin, who led the country for 30 years, no one contested the stereotype that "Stalin is today's Lenin." This conviction was so dinned into people's heads that even today some people are dumbfounded by the mere thought that the distortions of Leninist principles and norms of social life are rooted in those years and, to a considerable extent, in that authoritarian will.

The older generations still remember the thaw after the 20th party congress. A clear political awareness which riveted attention on history awakened in the public, and a thirst for truth and a critical attitude to the Stalinist canonical code, the "Short Course," legitimately arose. But restructuring was halted, giving way to deep stagnation in all spheres of social life. The fate of historical science, which seemingly had the greatest potential for penetrating the secrets of the past and the fate of Lenin's theoretical and practical legacy, took a dramatic turn. It was unable to regain this ability, lost during the years of repressive "leadership" of science, when true discussion and creative thought were ousted by authoritarian assessments, when ideological censuring of disliked authors and accusations of counterrevolution and wrecking were customary. This was followed by physical reprisals merely for any thought that broke loose from the general chorus.

Misunderstanding and sometimes organic rejection of the revolutionary spirit of Leninism were shrouded in oaths of loyalty to Leninist teaching and accompanied by parading of the speaker's own exceptional closeness to Lenin. Even behests of the founder of the party and the Soviet state which were achieved through agonized pondering of the lessons of enormous revolutionary experience, behests containing direct warnings against repetition of errors on this difficult road and suggesting ways of combating corrosion in society and the state, were consigned to oblivion.

Is that not why we now, in the hectic days of restructuring, see a repetition in many respects of the clashes about which Lenin wrote bitterly 70 years ago: "All this was written almost half a century ago, yet now it is necessary to carry out careful excavation work to bring undistorted Marxism home to the broad masses"?

Only after the 20th party congress was it possible to make the broad masses aware of a very important part of Lenin's political testament that had been hidden from them, his "Letter to the Congress." Other works by Lenin intended for immediate communication to the masses also had a difficult time.

In March 1917, Lenin sent the celebrated "Letters From Afar" to PRAVDA from Switzerland. Stalin and Kamenev, who were members of the editorial collegium, printed the first of them in "amended" form, removing from it descriptions of the leaders of the conciliationist parties who served the bourgeoisie and exposures of the antipeople policy of the Provisional Government, and did not publish the next three letters at all: They did not see the light until after Lenin's death in 1924, and the first letter was not published in full for another 25 years after that.

Lenin subtitled the article "How We Are To Reorganize the Worker-Peasant Inspectorate" "Proposal to the 12th Party Congress." Drafting this proposal at the same time as the "Letter to the Congress," Lenin was thinking about ways to strengthen control by the party and society over the activity of the supreme organs of power in the country and of limiting unchecked administration by decree on the part of officials who concentrated great power in their hands. At Lenin's insistence, the article was published in PRAVDA on 25 January 1923. But after the newspaper article, a letter was sent to party provincial committees in which the Central Committee Organizational Bureau and Politburo reported that Lenin, in view of his ill health, was not permitted to read newspapers, was not taking part in Politburo sessions, and was not being shown the minutes. Because he found complete mental inactivity unendurable, the doctors had permitted him to keep a kind of diary, in which he was

recording his thoughts on various issues, so extracts from this diary were appearing in the press at Lenin's insistence. The circular inspired an unambiguous attitude to the published article, depriving it of the significance which Lenin attached to it. In returning today to this work of Lenin's and his political testament as a whole, the theoretical thinking of the party is carrying out "excavations" that make it possible to reveal the missed opportunities of strict adherence to a Leninist course of socialism and democracy.

Mindful of the enormous danger posed to the state by bureaucracy, Lenin urged in his bequest to the party that a resolute struggle be waged against it. Having discovered this danger in the party Central Committee apparatus, he saw no other means of rooting out this evil than "weeding out" and "dismantling" the apparatuses infected by it and "beginning to rebuild them." That is how he put the question on 14 February 1922 in his letter to Molotov, then secretary of the Central Committee in charge of organizational and cadre questions. He pointed out the enormous power and gigantic potential possessed by the Central Committee: "We assign 200,000-400,000 party workers and through them thousands and thousands of nonparty people. And this gigantic communist work is completely fouled up by dim-witted bureaucracy!"

Lenin demanded that the restructuring of the apparatus and the cleansing of it from bureaucracy begin with the Central Committee apparatus and, first and foremost, with the Registration and Assignment Section. But this "cleanup" did not impress Stalin, and the bureaucratic experience of Molotov was most useful to him. Bureaucracy gained strength and grew....

In strengthening this system, Stalin was also concerned about its ideological backup. When revising Lenin's legacy, he could not ignore Engels, whose works ran counter to his own authoritarian pretensions. Lenin regarded Engels' article "Russian Tsarism's Foreign Policy" as one of his most important works written "in the spirit of the materialist understanding of history and the economic theory of Marx." Stalin, however, saw in it ideological and historical bankruptcy. To avoid "frightening the reader," he banned its publication in the journal BOLSHEVIK: He could not allow even Engels to "denigrate" the Russian tsars, from whom he had already begun to copy his methods of authoritarian rule. Engels, it was argued, had "forgotten" that a policy of conquest "was not the monopoly of the Russian tsars" and was "equally if not more characteristic of kings and diplomats of all the European countries."

Nor had Engels "discerned" (in the 1890 article) the imperialist struggle between Germany and Britain which later, according to Stalin, caused the outbreak of World War I. Replying to such complaints about Engels by German Social Democrats, Lenin noted back during World War I: "To equate or even to compare the international situations in 1891 and 1914 shows a complete lack of historicity."

Stalin's understanding of patriotism, which spawned his criticism of Engels, later developed into enthusiastic veneration of people "with a strong will and character," such as Ivan the Terrible and Malyuta Skuratov, and lessons of history, one of which was expressed by Stalin in the following terms, for example: "One of Ivan the Terrible's mistakes was that he failed to destroy the five major feudal families. Had he annihilated those five boyar families, the Time of Troubles would not have happened at all.... He should have been more resolute." The ex-Marxist Stalin imparted these astonishing thoughts to the director S.M. Eyzenshteyn and the artist N.K. Cherkasov in February 1947 in justification of the ban imposed on part two of the movie "Ivan the Terrible," which could not be screened until after the 20th party congress.

"Ideas" such as those led to the appearance of blatantly apologetic pseudoscientific and "artistic" literature designed to educate the popular masses in the traditions of the cult of the "strong personality" and the whip. It was not so much figures from the revolutionary-democratic camp as the inspirers of all kinds of liberation movements, the organizers of inhuman exploitation and military coups, admirals, adjutant generals, diplomats, and tsarist clerks who began to be portrayed as fighters for the people's ("national") cause. Their historical "services" were deliberately isolated from the social and class evaluation of their activity (or, at best, the latter was timidly suppressed). It does not matter whom a general set out to suppress or destroy—whether it was a French revolutionary struggling for Polish independence or the people's leader Pugachev—what is important is that he was acting here as a fervent "patriot" and from the "purely military viewpoint" in a very skillful and even progressive way. The new foundations of truly antiscientific, anti-Marxist and, furthermore, antidemocratic guidelines in writing about the historical past were being laid in a form adapted to "Marxist" terminology.

But no matter how much they filled the sphere of ideology and culture with stuff like this, a powerful voice reaches out from that pre-October era: "We are filled with a sense of national pride, and it is for that very reason that we **particularly** despise **our** servile past (when landed gentry led peasants to war to stifle the freedom of Hungary, Poland, Persia, and China)." That was said by Lenin on behalf of the people, who had overthrown the "Romanov, Bobrinskiy, and Purishkevich gang," which had besmirched their national dignity.

The ideology of the personality cult was an outright deviation from the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the historical process and achievements of Soviet historical science in the twenties and early thirties, not only on the history of the party but also in the understanding of

the more distant past. After the blow dealt to that ideology by the 20th and 22d CPSU Congresses, the public consciousness began to free itself from the dogmatic shackles of Stalin's code of party history. There was renewed interest in Lenin's theoretical and historical legacy. The need arose for a new reading of it, free from the accretions of the times of the cult when any dissent was decried as a divergence from party positions. The conditions conducive to creative work that were restored began bearing considerable fruit.

However, after the Central Committee October (1964) Plenum, the forces of opposition to the course of the 20th and 22d party congresses managed to carry out a series of measures aimed against the incipient democratization. The criticism of negative phenomena was suppressed, the very concept of the "period of the personality cult" was banned, criticism of Stalin himself ceased, the rehabilitation of the "Short Course" began, and the rehabilitation of Stalinism's victims was halted. In the social sciences, the merest sign of original thought and attempts to read Lenin in a new way in light of contemporary reality were suppressed.

There has now been a resolute change in the restoration of Lenin's assessments of historical events and of the politicians who formed his immediate entourage. Many representatives of the Leninist party guard who fell victim to slander and repression have been restored to the ranks of the heroes of October and the fighters for socialism. Soviet people's literary heritage—that important means of raising the social consciousness and an indicator of the successes in the restructuring of our life on Leninist principles—a legacy unjustly discredited under the conditions of Stalinism, is being returned to them.

Lenin's legacy and Lenin's experience of resolving revolutionary tasks are also being restored. It would be an unforgivable mistake on the part of the driving forces of restructuring if they were to disregard the lessons of that experience gained at such high cost. Especially since—and the PRAVDA editorial article "Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionary Nature of Thought and Action" made this point quite bluntly—the organizational bastions of stagnation in the apparatus which were formed in past decades have no intention of giving up without a fight.

Supreme Soviet Session Set for 24 May

LD231001 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree convokes the 9th session of the country's Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation on 24 May in Moscow. Questions submitted for examination will deal with the draft USSR Law on Cooperatives; the work of soviet and economic bodies for ensuring the implementation of the program for the construction of housing and cultural and consumer facilities in light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress; a report on the activity of the USSR Supreme Court; and the ratification of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Continues Discussions

LD201015 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Excerpts] The 7th session of the 11th convocation of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet continued in Moscow today. In the Presidium are Comrades Vorotnikov, Chebrikov, Demichev, Razumovskiy, Talyzin, and Biryukova. Over to the Georgiyevskiy Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace, where our special correspondent Olga Vasilenko is:

[Vasilenko] The debates on the first question, the housing program of the republic up to 2000, are over. [passage omitted]

After this, the deputies started to examine the second question on the agenda, improving the management of the economy in the republic. A report was delivered by Deputy Tabeyev, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. As you know, the raising of this question was the result of profound transformations that have started here literally in all spheres of the national economy. These transformations demand a completely new form of management. It long ago became clear that our old management apparatus is very unwieldy and cumbersome. It is capable only of methods of work by administrative command or for petty surveillance. Now this is [word indistinct].

So a plan for a completely new general management scheme is now being put forward. Work on it has been going on for a long time in the Council of Ministers, and the main thing in the document is to make the management apparatus mobile, relying solely on economic methods of management and on the new economic mechanism. With the change to new forms of management, the role of ministries and departments is changing. So even now the number of structural subdivisions of the central apparatus has been cut by nearly 40 percent. It is intended to cut the size of the apparatus by a total of 50-70 percent.

Furthermore, among other things the following reorganization is proposed: to abolish the republican State Committee for Vocational and Technical Training and the Ministry of Education, and in their place to set up a Ministry of Public Education of the republic. It is also thought expedient to combine the Ministry of Culture and the State Committee for Cinematography of the republic into a single republican Ministry of Culture. A state Committee for Nature Protection and an Agricultural Committee for the RSFSR non-Chernozem Zone have also been created.

In general it is clear from the report that if new forms of managing the national economy with the help of party and soviet organs are introduced everywhere and as fast as possible, they will be an important factor in speeding up the social and economic development of the republic.

There is now a break, and after this short break the deputies will go on to examine the next question, the draft law of the Russian Federation on popular discussion of important questions of state life.

Discusses Economic Reform

LD201342 Moscow TASS in English 1320 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—One in five economic executive positions in the Russian Federation are to be cut in the near future and the more than 263,000 laid-off officials of ministries and agencies in this largest Soviet constituent republic will move to new jobs in industry, the service sector, education and other fields.

Measures to streamline the system of economic management in Russia were discussed today by its parliament, the Supreme Soviet.

Speaking in the debate, deputies analyzed how suggested management revamping plan corresponds to the requirements of the perestroyka (restructuring) policy.

They approved the first major step already taken along these lines, namely the conversion of factories under 12 republican ministries and agencies to the pay-your-own-way system. These factories are responsible for more than 80 percent of gross production in Russia.

The number of ministries is to be reduced and the staffs of the remaining ones are to be slashed.

The Ministry of Geology of the Russian Federation has already been abolished. The state committee for vocational training and the Ministry of Education are to follow suit to make way for a Ministry of Public Education.

A total of 84 republican-level industrial amalgamations are to be dissolved and over 100 ministries, agencies and administrations are to be eliminated in the autonomous republics of the Russian Federation.

Completes Session

PM251005 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Apr 88 First Edition p 1

["Information Report on RSFSR Supreme Soviet Sessions. Seventh Session of RSFSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation"]

[Text] The second session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet opened at 1330 on 19 April in the Great Kremlin Palace.

On the platform were Comrades V.I. Vorotnikov, N.N. Slyunkov, P.N. Demichev, N.V. Talyzin, and A.P. Biryukova.

Deputy N.M. Gribachev, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, presided.

There was continuing discussion of the question of the work of RSFSR soviet and economic organs to provide every family with its own separate apartment or individual house by the year 2000 in accordance with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. The following deputies spoke in the debates on the report and the coreport: I.M. Cherpanov, (Orekhovo-Zuyevskiy Electoral Okrug, Moscow Oblast); P.A. Levin (Leninskiy Electoral Okrug, Chuvash ASSR); V.A. Bokov (Barabinskiy Electoral Okrug, Novosibirsk Oblast); A.Ya. Panina (Chaykovskiy Electoral Okrug, Perm Oblast); V.M. Vidmanov (Nizhneingashskiy Electoral Okrug, Krasnoyarsk Kray); G.V. Krivyakov (Ordzhonikidzevskiy Electoral Okrug, Bashkir ASSR); M.G. Komarova (Pribaykalskiy Electoral Okrug, Buryat ASSR); V.A. Desyatnikov (Leninskiy Electoral Okrug, Kirov Oblast); V.O. Astafyev (Kurtamyshskiy Electoral Okrug, Kurgan Oblast); Yu.A. Nozhikov (Bratskiy Electoral Okrug, Irkutsk Oblast); S.N. Markin (Ordzhonikidzevskiy Electoral Okrug, Yakutsk ASSR); and N.P. Druzeva (Belgorodskiy Electoral Okrug, Belgorod Oblast).

The 7th session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation, continued its work 20 April 1988. The third session opened at 1000 hours in the Great Kremlin Palace.

On the platform were Comrades V.I. Vorotnikov, V.M. Chebrikov, P.N. Demichev, G.P. Razumovskiy, N.V. Talyzin, and A.P. Biryukova.

Deputy N.M. Gribachev, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, presided.

There was continuing discussion of the question of the work of the RSFSR's soviet and economic organs to provide every family by the year 2000 with a separate apartment or individual house in accordance with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. The following deputies spoke in the debates on the report and coreport: S.N. Sabaneyev (Sasovskiy Electoral Okrug, Ryazan Oblast); A.I. Gordiyenko (Khanty-Mansiyskiy Electoral Okrug, Tyumen Oblast); V.I. Sabanov (Turinskiy Electoral Okrug, Sverdlovsk Oblast); V.S. Urayskiy (Osinnikovskiy Electoral Okrug, Kemerovo Oblast); A.A. Melguzova (Pervomayskiy Electoral Okrug, Murmansk Oblast); M.G. Vagin (Semenovskiy Electoral Okrug, Gorkiy Oblast).

Here the RSFSR Supreme Soviet ended the debate on the second question on the session agenda.

O.I. Lobov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, delivered the final speech.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution on the work of RSFSR soviet and economic organs to provide every family by the year 2000 with a separate apartment or individual house in accordance with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

F.A. Tabeyev, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, delivered a report on the third question on the session agenda—the improvement of RSFSR economic management.

The following deputies took part in the debates: I.S. Boldyrev (Mineralovodskiy Electoral Okrug, Stavropol Kray); A.A. Sokolov (Kanavinskiy Electoral Okrug, Gorkiy Oblast); N.N. Sycheva (Varnenskiy Electoral Oblast, Chelyabinsk Oblast); Yu.S. Sukhin (Borisoglebskiy Electoral Okrug, Voronezh Oblast); A.A. Vasilyev (Gornomariyskiy Electoral Okrug, Mari ASSR); V.D. Lozovoy (Tsentralnyy Electoral Okrug, Orenburg Oblast).

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution on improving RSFSR economic management.

Then the RSFSR Supreme Soviet moved on to examine the following question—the RSFSR draft law on people's discussion of important questions of state life. Deputy V.K. Foteyev, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Legislative Proposals Commission, delivered a report. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet adopted a RSFSR Law on People's Discussion of Important Questions of State Life.

After this deputies heard a report by Deputy S.I. Chistoplyasov, secretary of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and adopted appropriate laws and resolutions.

At this point the 7th session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, completed its work.

Journalists Union Discusses Restructuring

PM220825 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "The Press and Restructuring"]

[Text] Helping the party to provide ideological support for the urgent problems associated with the radical economic reform taking place in the country is the duty of each member of a creative union. That was the theme of a routine plenum of the USSR Journalists Union Board held 20 April.

The report "The CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum and the Role of Journalistic Organizations in Implementing the Economic Reform," delivered by A. Baranov, secretary of the board and chief editor of SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, and the speeches by plenum participants stressed that the mass media are acting vigorously and combatively, are asking principled questions about economic development, are promoting the dissemination of labor collectives' vibrant initiatives, and are putting those who are opposing and hampering restructuring under the glasnost spotlight.

At the same time, not all journalists have restructured themselves or felt their personal responsibility for social renewal, and not all ar showing the proper competence or grounding of knowl dge in publicizing the processes taking place in the country. Certain publications, in pursuit of higher circulation, are rushing to publish unverified facts and immature, subjective judgments, and restrict themselves to half-truths. Editorial bureaus sometimes forget that criticism means responsibility above all, and that the existence of different opinions and views does not indicate total license but presupposes democratic discussions aimed at seeking the truth.

The plenum wholly shares the assessments and conclusions of the PRAVDA editorial article "Principles of Restructuring: The Revolutionary Nature of Thinking and Action" and supports the statement issued by creative unions in connection with it.

The participants in the USSR Journalists Union Board plenum adopted an appeal to the 19th all-union party conference. [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 21 April in its Second Edition carries on page two a report comprising paragraphs one, four, and five of the above item.]

Historians' Letter Supports Perestroyka

LD232123 Mosocw TASS in English 2120 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 24 TASS—"Soviet historians wholly support the party's policy of realising the ideological, political and economic potentials of perestroyka, of reviving and consolidating the Leninist principles of socialist development." This was stated by prominent Soviet historians (academicians and corresponding members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences) in a letter to the editorial board of PRAVDA.

"Fully supporting the principled stand of the editorial article in PRAVDA of April 6, 1988 in the assessment of tendencies directed against perestroyka, we call for the consolidation of creative efforts of Soviet people aimed at upgrading socialism, at the constructive renewal of society. Preparing with all the people for the 19th all-union party conference we express complete support for the party's course at revolutionary perestroyka," says the letter published in PRAVDA today.

"The people has made the choice. There is no and there can be no return to the methods of guidance and practices, that have outlined themselves," the letter says. The letter was signed by Sergey Tikhvinskiy, Yulian Bromlei, Aleksandr Samsonov, Isaak Mints, Maksim Kim and other prominent scientists, altogether 18 people.

PRAVDA also reported that the editorial board had received letters in support of the article "The Principles of Perestroyka: Revolutionary Character of Thinking and Actions" from the Presidium of the Union of Scientific and Engineering Societies of the USSR, a group of researchers of the Institute of Biology of Development, a number of republican boards of the Creative Workers' Union, many other public organisations and individual citizens.

TV Program on Ministers' Opposition to Glasnost

OW220153 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0905 GMT 13 Apr 88

["Restructuring Spotlight" program, presented by commentator Yevgeniy Sinitsyn]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Our camera crew was barred from a plant, a factory, or a construction site. I could give you many examples of such incidents. They were afraid that we would film something negative. Previously, when we mainly covered the positive things in life, this never occured. We were welcome everywhere. We will continue to cover the positive things in our lives, the visible experience of perestroyka. But there is nothing worse than standing water that should be running.

And so our journalistic words, when they fall into a whirlpool of boastful epithets, turn into something like distilled water with which one cannot wash himself or quench his thirst. That is the way things have been and continue to be today.

But today, interest in the press, including the electronic press that we represent, has grown immeasurably, because more truth has begun to appear in our articles and programs. Obviously, somebody does not like this, and we will give you some specific names later in the program as to who this may be. [video cuts from studio to show correspondent I. Osadchuk speaking to an unidentified man in the street.]

[Begin recording] [Osadchuk] What is your opinion of materials in the press that expose shortcomings in our lives?

[First man] I do not know. [laughs] I cannot answer you. [end recording]

We found only one person like that. Let us pause on Moskovskiy Boulevard near the newspaper kiosk. Let us read a few of the headlines of articles and notes. We catch ourselves wanting to continue reading, like these people are doing. [video shows newspaper pages on display in newspaper kiosk, a couple reading the pages. Headlines read: "Give the Spare Link a Tug," "Silence Means Being Dumb," and "Around the Conflict." Video cuts away to show another unidentified man]

[Begin recording] [Second man] This criticism that is aimed at improving our lives, at accelerating perestroyka, does not always reach the ministries, I think. Apparently there are still people who do not like it. [video cuts to show Osadchuk talking to a young couple]

[Osadchuk] What do you think, are all the shortcomings in our lives reflected in the press?

[Third man] No, not all of them of course.

[First woman] We are living in the period of glasnost and there should be more information, not only about our internal life, but about external affairs too. [video shows Osadchuk interviewing another young man]

[Fourth man] There is now a lot more glasnost in the papers. This was not the case before. Of course the press is a mirror of our life. [end recording]

Just a mirror. I would like to draw your attention to one clause in the well-known 5 April 1988 PRAVDA. I quote: There are some who are prepared to see all misfortunes, all the disagreeable things of life today in terms of the newspapers loosening their tongues, being judgemental about everything, stirring up public opinion, and so forth. One must understand that the newspaper column is a secondary thing. The primary thing is life itself. In order for shortcomings not to appear in the newspapers, they must not appear in real life. [video shows page 2 of the 5 April 1988 PRAVDA, then cuts to show the facade of the USSR Ministry of Railways building]

The newspapers have loosened their tongues. This is what Nikolay Semenovich Konarev, USSR minister of railways, thinks, and I am using materials that were made available to me in the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee. [video shows the facade of the TRUD newspaper building.] Nikolay Semenovich is very unhappy with and opposes, among other things, the publication of the article in TRUD. Here is the article. [video shows newspaper page with bold headline reading: "Ruisbolo, a Typical Accident?" then cuts to show V.E. Karpov, the article's author, speaking to an off-camera reporter]

[Begin Karpov recording] I will recall the events. In autumn last year there was another accident on the railroads. It was an accident involving a passenger train and a freight train. People perished, dozens of people died; more than 30 people. I was instructed to investigate this accident and establish the causes that led to it. During this work I had to talk to many people, including specialists and ordinary workers.

Well, first of all,the attitude towards the people who work on the railroads—the engine drivers, the railway division workers—is generally quite shabby. Formalism predominates in many things. People do not have normal conditions for labor or recreation, there are not

enough apartments, and working conditions are poor. The engine driver who was at the controls of the train involved in the accident had not rested for nearly half a day prior to it.

We have obsolete railway equipment; we do not have enough machines or equipment, not only on this line but on many of our country's railways. [end Karpov recording]

Surely the minister should be aware of this. What is he unhappy about?

[Begin recording] [Karpov] I think the habits of past years, when it was not customary to talk out loud about these sore points, these problems, played a role. In those days accidents or mishaps were represented as unique events, not as typical occurences. Yet here the story says that the situation was very similar, and it highlighted the situation throughout the entire branch. It showed that the situation throughout the branch demands capital and immediate repairs. That is the problem, naturally, when these shortcomings are talked about aloud; besides, when the habit of listening to criticism aloud has not been developed, this kind of criticism...[video cuts abruptly to show Osadchuk talking to a man on a park bench]

[Fifth man] It is hard to change old convictions right away. It must be proven to a man that he is wrong about something. Now when this becomes his conviction he will naturally begin to work in a new way and more correctly. [video shows people reading newspapers displayed on a street kiosk.] [end recording]

Indeed, even the mind of a minister can be changed. Here is another example, an example of a conflict that began between this ministry [video shows the facade of the USSR Ministry Of the Medical and Microbiological Industry, then cuts to show the door to the MEDITSINSKAYA GAZETA newspaper office] and the MEDITSINSKAYA GAZETA newspaper. [video shows K.V. Shcheglov, the paper's chief editor, in an office talking to Sinitsyn.]

[Begin recording] [Shcheglov] It was an oversensitive reaction to criticism, oversensitive, particularly to penetrating articles.

[Sinitsyn] Take Kirishi, for example. Tell us about this.

[Shcheglov] The reaction was oversensitive before Kirishi, particularly over the paper's articles on problems relating to (Totreks) and the position adopted by the ministry, this ministry, in regard to this problem. So apparently the publication of an open letter from the Kirishi biochemicals plant addressed to Chazov, USSR Minister of Health; Murakhovskiy, chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom; and Valeriy Alekseyevich Bykov, the minister himself, was the last straw that exhausted the patience of the ministry.

[Sinitsyn] And of the minister personally. [end recording] [video shows a page of MEDITSINSKAYA GAZETA showing a headline reading: "How are we to live and work further?" Video then cuts to show the Kirishi Biochemicals plant in Leningrad Oblast]

How are we to live and work further? This plant became an eyesore in this city and its environs a long time ago. The production of protein and vitamin concentrates, PVC, here disturbs the ecology, seriously increases the incidence of diseases, particularly among children. And the plant's workers, who are experiencing unexplainable feelings of guilt, have requested in this letter that clarity be brought into the situation which has been created around the PVC production. Either close the plant or end all the various bad rumors conclusively and convincingly. [video cuts to show a petition with numerous signatures]

Valeriy Alekseyevich, they plead with the minister, we express the hope that the the real answer to our request will be the adoption of concrete measures. Now what did you receive, what was the response? [video again shows Shcheglov in his office]

[Begin recording] [Shcheglov] Well, we received this ultimatum signed by Medunov, chief of the Administration of Affairs. It notes that at a regular meeting of the collegium on 14 April a report of the chief editor on the paper's coverage of questions concerning the ministry's activities would be heard.

[Sinitsyn] Apparently they want to make you a pocket publication, so to speak.

[Shcheglov] Yes, it appears that symptoms of intentions of this kind are in evidence, in one way or another. I think that presently we do not have a departmental press. There are general party and political newspapers required to cover the state of affairs and the completion of tasks in one branch or another.

It borders on the absurd. Neither the chief editor, his deputy, nor the editor of the Department of Medical Material and Technical Supply to Health Services, who covers the problems of this branch, have passes giving them access to the Ministry of the Medical and Microbiological Industry. They are simply not admitted to the ministry. [end recording]

It goes without saying that we too would not be admitted. [video shows building facade and a group of workers] Therefore, we ask the minister, Valeriy Alekseyevich Bykov, to respond to us in writing. But the first response must nonetheless go to the workers of the plant who gave their letter to the editorial office the following title: How are We To Live and Work Further? [video cuts back to show Sinitsyn in the studio.]

We should also direct this question to ourselves as newspaper, radio, and television workers. How would we like to live and work further? Let us dream a little. The head of a department calls the editorial office and asks that shortcomings that are an obstacle to achievement of foremost results be publicized. After all, we have a single aim and a single task. Why is it that we are not receiving such calls? Indeed we do have the same aims and tasks.

So I will reiterate. In order for shortcomings not to appear in the pages of the press or on our broadcasts, they must not appear in real life.

Armenians Gather in Moscow To Mark 'Genocide'
AU241327 Paris AFP in English 1044 GMT 24 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, April 24 (AFP)—Hundreds of Armenians gathered in Moscow's Armenian cemetery Sunday, under the close watch of Soviet security forces, to mark the 1915 massacres of the Armenian people by the Turks and to commemorate those who died in February inter-ethnic riots in the Azerbaijani city of Sumgait.

In Yerevan, meanwhile, police did not intervene as the traditional annual April 24 procession by Armenians to the "genocide monument" at the entrance to the city went ahead, Armenians contacted by telephone told AFP.

Uniformed police equipped with loud-hailers stood by steel barriers erected at the entrance to the cemetery as the Armenians filed in, some carrying flowers. As the crowds swelled, groups of 10 or 20 people were allowed in at one time, but police told those waiting in the queue that all would be permitted to enter. The priest of the Armenian church inside the cemetery appealed to the crowd to stand calmly and refrain from turning Sunday's gathering into a rally, as there were calls by some present for a demonstration outside the Turkish Embassy here. "There must be no disorder," he said, speaking in Armenian. Soviet authorities had threatened to cancel a scheduled service at the church, if a rally was organised, Armenians at the cemetery said.

Armenian Artushes Alexanyan told AFP that there were more people at the cemetery than on the same date last year, because of the events in Sumgait in which 26 Armenians and six Azerbaijanis were killed and 197 injured, according to an official toll. But Armenians say that the real toll was much higher.

Entry to the cemetery had been closely controlled on previous Sundays by police since Armenians staged a series of mass rallies there in the wake of the inter-ethnic unrest in the southern republics of Armenia and Azerbaijan over the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh. The unrest two months ago in the Armenian-dominated enclave inside Azerbaijan, which Armenians want transferred to Armenia, sparked the riots in Sumgait from February 27 to 29. More than 60 people have so far been arrested in a top-level investigation into the "pogroms, murder and rape" cases, according to the weekly Moscow News. Soviet authorities have promised a 400 million ruble (600 dollar) investment in Nagorno-Karabakh, providing for more roads, schools and housing to be built to improve the situation of the Armenians there. But the central authorities have refused the Armenians' main demand for the enclave's return to Armenian jurisdiction. The mainly Christian region has been part of Moslem Azerbaijan since 1921.

Landslides Necessitate Kirghizia Evacuation
LD231918 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 23 Apr 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An alarming situation has developed of late in the mountain regions of Kirghizia. These shots were taken in the Suzakskiy Rayon, where, as a result of landslides, it has been necessary to evacuate entire settlements. The material damage done in this rayon alone is more than R3.5 million. An extraordinary commission has been set up in the republic to combat the natural disaster and help is being given to those in need. [video shows scenes in the rayon, destroyed homes, local people, and an overall view of the landslides]

Economic

Aganbegyan Discusses Bureaucratic 'Props'
AU221331 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 20 Apr 88 p 6

[Interview with Abel Gazevich Aganbegyan, academician secretary of the Economics Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, "by NOVOSTI especially for RABOTNICHESKO DELO": "Prerequisites for Acceleration"—date and place not given]

[Text] [NOVOSTI] Abel Gazevich, the administrative-bureaucratic approach in solving important tasks in the national economy still exists even now, in the period of restructuring. What has maintained this approach in the economy?

[Aganbegyan] The administrative economic bureaucracy rests on three supports, whose historic and economic roots go far back into the past. The first of these is the specific tasks set by directives: What is to be done, how much is to be spent, what forms of products are to be manufactured, and so on. The imposition of tasks "from above," which destroys the initiative, creativity, and independence of "the lower floors in the national economy," was a feature of the former system that we have already renounced. We have begun a gradual transition toward a new economic model that excludes this directive approach as a fundamental management method.

The second prop of the bureaucracy is the centralized allocation of resources. In the new model for managing the economy, centralized allocation is being abolished. It is being replaced by wholesale trade in means of production in forms like developing direct trading links between the enterprises, as well as trade (when it is beneficial) through a middleman agency on a wholesale and economic accountability basis.

Lastly, the third support of the bureaucratic mechanism is the firm, detailed "protection" of the superior organs. Formerly in the enterprises and organizations, the activities of everyone were individually governed by regulations and subject to unnecessary control, and an immense bureaucratic apparatus was created to exert this control.

Until recently more than 2,000 normative documents existed to regulate the activities of the industrial enterprises. These documents are now being reviewed from the standpoint of the new law concerning the socialist enterprise, and as a result the bulk of them are being annulled. A special governmental commission is dealing with this.

[NOVOSTI] What are the distinguishing features of the present transitional period in the restructuring of the economy?

[Aganbegyan] The complexity of the transition period lies in that it has arrived in the middle of the 5-year-plan period, when our economy is bound by the previously ratified 5-year plans. Certain capital investments have already been made, orders for equipment have been placed, and construction is taking place—all this is a reality that we have to consider, a reality restricting our economy and markedly tying up its resources. This is the first distinguishing feature of our time.

The second distinguishing feature is the old prices system that has been in effect until now, despite the fact that it has long lost its function as a yardstick. Let us take fuel oil as an example. Its price has been cut to the absolute minimum; in many parts of the country it is cheaper to burn than coal. The USSR burns four times more fuel oil than the United States, where oil prices are quite high. Price restructuring is a demand of our time, and the new prices system will soon replace the old one. However, this will not happen in a day, but in stages. The price reform is scheduled for 1989-90, and work has recently been started on drafting the new pricing system. The draft law for retail prices will be submitted for wide public discussion, as provided for in the materials of the CPSU Central Committee July 1987 Plenum.

In accordance with the postulates of the CPSU Central Committee July 1987 Plenum, the adjustment of retail prices is to be made in such a way as not to reduce the standard of living, but even to increase it in the case of individual parts of the population. The reform of the scientific and state organizations is also being drawn up from the same viewpoint. More specifically, the possibility is being examined of cutting the prices of a number of industrially produced consumer goods.

If a decision is adopted to raise the prices of meat and dairy products and bread, and to cut the currently immense state subsidies for the production of these goods, then the population will certainly receive full compensation for the additional expenditures.

[NOVOSTI] Cuts in the management apparatus are being implemented in the USSR. What is the scale of these cuts?

[Aganbegyan] The apparatus of the union and republican ministries and departments, including that of the USSR Gosplan, has been cut 30-50 percent. Organization structures are being altered, superfluous units in all organs of government are being eliminated. In conformity with the new economic mechanism, which will be based on economic methods of management (in contrast to the old administrative methods) the functions and directions of the work of the ministries, departments, and other organs of government will radically change. Of course, all this is aimed against bureaucratic approaches, but time will tell the strength of the effects.

[NOVOSTI] Finally, what is the leitmotiv of the present transitional stage in restructuring the economy?

[Aganbegyan] It is clear we now have to strive to achieve the maximum effect from the new system of government. It will come into full effect during the next 5-year-plan period, from 1991. Notwithstanding this, important tasks are also being solved at the present stage. The rights of the enterprises and their labor collectives are being considerably expanded. More specifically, the latter will themselves handle their funds (for development, production, social development, and material incentives), which will increase three- or fourfold. There will be greatly increased opportunities in the field of labor and wages, extending collective piecework, and so on. People must learn how to work utilizing economic methods, how to work in self-management conditions, and how to live actively in the period of the further democratization of our society. Accordingly, the 3 years until the end of the 5-year-plan period are an important stage. I think that a further step will be made as early as 1989 in extending the independence of the enterprises, since a wholesale price reform is expected, and it is planned to market the products of up to one-third of the means of production through the wholesale trade system. And, of course, 1990 will be a year of even more far-reaching measures on the road toward full economic accountability.

Dolgikh, Slyunkov Speak on Modernizing Equipment
PM221505 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Conference at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A conference on supplying the power industry with high-quality modern equipment was held at the CPSU Central Committee 15 April. Taking part in its work were scientists, designers, and specialists from scientific research institutes, associations, and enterprises in the machine building and power industries, leaders of ministries and central departments, secretaries of union republic Communist Party Central Committees and party kraykoms and obkoms, and senior officials of the apparatuses of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the USSR People's Control Committee.

The conference was opened by N.N. Slyunkov, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary.

Reports were delivered by B.Ye. Shcherbina and I.S. Silayev, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairmen.

V.I. Dolgikh, Politburo candidate member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, who addressed the conference, emphasized that the situation in the power industry remains tense. A number of regions are experiencing a shortage of generating capacity and there are difficulties with power supplies.

Our power industry is embarking on a special, more complex, and crucial stage in its development. It is necessary to sharply increase the commissioning of new power capacities and at the same time to rebuild and modernize existing power stations and to implement major measures in the power supply and environmental protection spheres.

There is much to be done in further developing and ensuring the absolute reliability of the nuclear power industry.

It is necessary to pay more attention to questions of developing the hydroelectric power industry. It is one of the most economical and environmentally clean sources of electricity. The existing hydroelectric power stations enable around 80 million tonnes of standard fuel to be saved each year. On 1 December 1987 the CPSU Central Committee adopted a decision to formulate measures for the accelerated development of this progressive sphere.

Deliveries of high quality modern equipment, instruments, and other machinery must be increased. In the first 2 years of the 5-year plan, however, the USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building's supplies to the power industry were 20 percent below target for turbine units and 10 percent below target for steam boilers. The USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry met only 82 percent of the target for the supply of turbine generators. Only 65 percent of the demand for subassemblies and parts for modernizing and extending the lifetime of equipment is being satisfied. There is a backlog in the supply of equipment for thermal and hydroelectric power stations scheduled to be commissioned this year. When concluding contracts some plants set late dates for equipment manufacture.

Leaders of machine building ministries, institutes, and design bureaus have resigned themselves to the view that in terms of a number of important technical and economic indicators Soviet machinery, units, and instruments are inferior to the best foreign counterparts.

Some types of technological equipment have a low standard of operational reliability. The USSR State Committee for Standards and enterprise leaders must be more strict in their demands and step up personal responsibility for the quality of machine building output.

Work to create and increase the production of modern gas turbine and steam-gas installations is developing poorly and there has been intolerable delay in developing and producing equipment to filter pollutants from thermal power station and boiler stack gas.

Power workers and machine builders must take all possible measures to ensure the commissioning of the power capacities planned for this year and the unconditional fulfillment of the targets for the retooling and modernization of power stations and for raising the power industry to qualitatively new levels.

The conference was addressed by O.G. Anfimov and V.M. Velichko, USSR ministers, G.D. Kolmogorov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Standards, B.I. Fomin and A.A. Voronko, general directors of the "Elektrosila" Association and the Sumy Machine Building Association respectively, V.K. Bronnikov, director of the Zaporozhskaya AES, G.G. Olkhovskiy, director of the All-Union Heat Engineering Scientific Research Institute, K.P. Murenin, secretary of Saratov CPSU Obkom, and others.

The closing speech was delivered by N.N. Slyunkov. He noted that the questions under discussion are directly connected with fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution of 10 March 1988. The point is to accelerate the development of the country's power engineering industry and to increase the reliability of consumers' power supplies by constantly raising the technical standard, substantially improving the quality, and significantly increasing the efficiency of power station machinery and units.

Profound changes are taking place in the machine building and fuel and energy complexes. Today's examination of the situation demonstrates that comrades are critically evaluating the situation and looking to the future.

At the same time the situation regarding the supply of high quality modern equipment to the power industry is becoming difficult. The main attention should be focused on improving the technical standard and quality

of equipment. To a large extent the reliable and continuous supply of electricity to the national economy depends on this. Major measures must be taken by the USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems, and other ministries and departments to increase the level of automation of power installations and increase their reliability and efficiency.

Machine builders are taking a long time to put new technical solutions and developments into practice. The period from beginning the creation of equipment to its commissioning is becoming longer. The efforts of researchers and designers are not coordinated and there is much duplication in their work.

The scientific and technical councils of ministries and the bureaus of the machine building and fuel and energy complexes should play a substantial role here. The State Committee for Science and Technology should also take a principled stand. Everyone today—those who design new equipment, those who create it, and those who use it—must clearly realize that the development of the power industry is the most important economic and state task whose solution determines to a great extent the pace of scientific and technical progress and the structural reorganization of our economy. It is all the more necessary to understand this fact because many sectors and associations are involved here.

There are serious complaints about the quality of machine building output. The operational reliability of certain types of power engineering equipment made by the "Elektrosila" and "Uralelektrotyazhmash" Associations, boiler units produced by "Krasnyy Kotelshchik" and the Podolsk Machine Building Plant, and turbines made by the "Kharkovskiy Turbostroitelnyy Zavod" and "Leningradskiy Metallicheskiy Zavod" associations is inadequate. The situation concerning the operational reliability of equipment is aggravated by grave breaches of the rules governing its storage and installation at construction sites. State acceptance, state supervisory organs, and monitoring departments should be more resolute on these matters. Nor can party committees remain aloof here. Their persistence and purposefulness will determine the progress of work to improve quality and switch to new equipment and technology.

The key task is to ensure that the power industry is supplied with equipment strictly according to schedule. Each ministry involved in equipment supply must analyze the situation in depth and implement specific measures to ensure the precise fulfillment of deliveries.

Party committees must make full use of their right of monitoring and must be more demanding toward economic cadres for the prompt production and supply of the necessary machines and units to power industry sites. The USSR Gossnab, metallurgical workers, chemical workers, and other subcontractors must ensure that supplies of materials and components to machine building plants are accurate and on time.

Failure to coordinate the commissioning of power industry units with supplies of equipment and the allocation of the relevant resources is having an adverse effect on the power industry's development. Central planning organs are clearly not working properly here.

The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification and the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation should adopt a more responsible approach to equipment orders and eliminate the erroneous practice whereby the plan includes supplies of machinery and units for projects whose state of construction is far behind schedule and where work on projects nearing completion is being held up because of a lack of the necessary equipment.

Above-norm stocks of equipment left over at power industry construction sites run to hundreds of millions of rubles. It is absolutely intolerable that our economy should have to bear the burden of vast quantities of unused material assets through the fault of certain irresponsible workers.

In the conditions created by the Law on the State Enterprise, central economic departments and ministries must clarify the process of elaborating plans for the production and supply of equipment to power industry construction sites. The plan must really unite all stages of equipment creation, manufacture, supply, installation, tuning, commissioning, and of course the construction of power stations.

It is necessary to considerably improve the level of factory readiness of the machines and units supplied and to ensure that they are supplied fully in line with the demands of installation techniques. Leaders of the machine building and fuel and energy complexes must closely examine all the conference's proposals on organizing servicing, particularly regarding nuclear power stations.

The expansion of work to retool existing power stations where a large quantity of worn-out equipment is in use is an urgent question today. We must achieve a fundamental breakthrough here. Party committees must play their part.

The standard cost price of each installed kilowatt of capacity has been increasing in recent years. The relocation of new construction work to the east and north has undoubtedly had an effect. Environmental protection measures involve large additional costs. But at the same time the unjustified raising of the price of many types of power industry equipment, including gas and steam turbines, boiler units, generators, instruments, and certain types of auxiliary equipment is continuing. Designers, planners, and builders are making far from complete

use of reserves for reducing the materials- and metal-intensiveness of output and are not good at looking for fundamentally new solutions.

The national economy is suffering considerable losses from a failure to observe the policy of thrift in the generation and use of electricity and fuel. Research into the production of power from nontraditional sources is continuing too slowly. Work is spread out among a variety of ministries and departments. The State Committee for Science and Technology is failing to provide the proper coordination.

The logical conclusion to all this is that ministry and department leaders, our scientists, and the manufacturers and users of power industry equipment are not implementing satisfactorily the party's guidelines on the pursuit of a firm energy-saving policy.

All efforts must be directed toward fulfilling the fuel and energy saving targets—a creative scientific quest, increased exactingness on the part of control and inspection organs, stricter plan, technological, and production discipline, a flexible and principled stance by economic and financial departments, and the energy and initiative of the broad masses of the working people.

Party organs must show concern for this.

The construction of power industry facilities is running into difficulties. The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification and USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation have everything necessary to carry out the full sequence of power station construction work. They have planning institutes, major construction trusts, and installation subdivisions. However, the organization of the construction process is unsatisfactory. The material base is inadequate and the targets for its development are not being met. The commissioning of capacities included in the Energy Program is not being ensured.

Ministry leaders together with the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for the Fuel and Energy Complex and the USSR Gosstroy must thoroughly investigate the situation, establish where the bottlenecks lie, and reallocate material resources and manpower to concentrate them on the most important areas.

In brief, there must be more work in all areas. It must be done with persistence and a high sense of responsibility, as the party demands. The most important thing is to vigorously activate all party organizations at lower levels and labor collectives. It is necessary to comprehensively utilize the economic levers and incentives provided by the new management mechanism and analyze in greater depth the processes and development trends in the power industry.

We have sufficient strength and potential to fulfill the Energy Program. All it needs now is high consciousness, good organization, discipline, and the desire and ability to keep in step with restructuring.

Taking part in the conference were Yu.P. Batalin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and A.I. Volskiy, A.G. Melnikov, and I.P. Yastrebov, chiefs of CPSU Central Committee Departments.

Decree Issued on Planning, Fulfillment of Tasks

WA18200129 Moscow SOBRAINYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA ROSSISKOY SOVETSKOY FEDERATIVNOY SOTSIALISTICHESKOY RESPUBLIKI in Russian No 5 1988 pp 69-70

[Decree issued on 24 December 1987 by the USSR Council of Ministers "On the Forms and Methods of Organizing Work for Ensuring the Fulfillment by Enterprises and Associations of Monthly Planning Tasks under the New Economic Conditions"]

[Text] With the goals of improving the organization and increasing the rythmic nature of the work of the RSFSR national economy, guaranteeing the stability of plans of enterprises and organizations and in executing the decree of the USSR Council of Ministers of 10 December 1987 No 1409 (SP USSR, 1988 No 4, p 9) the RSFSR Council of Ministers decrees:

1. To establish in 1988-1990 the following order for forming monthly tasks by the enterprises and associations of the ministries and departments of the RSFSR, the Moscow Oblispolkom and the Moscow and Leningrad Gorispolkoms:

On the basis of and taking into account the inital data reported by the higher organizations the enterprises and associations independently determine the volume of production of industrial products (work, services) in cost terms per month;

Monthly plans for deliveries of products in the nomenclature of the state order are worked out and confirmed independently by the enterprises and associations, proceeding from the tasks of the corresponding quarter and contracts concluded with consumers;

The enterprises and associations implement monthly planning of output of products according to direct ties on the basis of contracts with consumers;

In forming monthly plans the enterprises and associations of the ministries and departments of the RSFSR, the Moscow Oblispolkom and the Moscow and Leningrad Gorispolkoms proceed from the need for even spacing and rythmic delivery of products to the consumers.

The enterprises and associations are to report to the RSFSR ministries and departments, the Moscow Oblispolkom and the Moscow and Leningrad Gorispolkoms monthly inter-quarter plans for production of industrial products in cost terms no later than 20 days before the beginning of the corresponding quarter.

The ministries and departments of the RSFSR, the Moscow Oblispolkom, and the Moscow and Leningrad Gorispolkoms analyze and summarize the information of the monthly plans submitted by the enterprises and associations and report it to Gosplan RSFSR and the RSFSR State Committee for Statistics no later than 15 days before the beginning of the quarter.

Gosplan RSFSR and the RSFSR State Committee for Statistics summarize the material received and report the results to the RSFSR Council of Ministers no later than 10 days before the beginning of the quarter.

2. The ministries and departments of the RSFSR, the Councils of Ministers of autonomous republics, krayispolkoms, oblispolkoms and the Moscow and Leningrad Gorispolkoms are to take measures to ensure the stability of the plans confirmed by the enterprises and associations not to disrupt the rythmic nature of the work in these difficult sectors.

In specific circumstances when contract responsibilities are changed on the request of the consumer, the corresponding changes are to be included in the monthly plans by the enterprises and associations no later than 15 days before the end of the month and reported to the ministries and departments of the RSFSR, the Moscow Oblispolkom, the Moscow and Leningrad Gorispolkoms and the organs of state statistics, with the exception of those cases where other changes in monthly plans have been established by existing legislation.

The ministries and departments of the RSFSR, the Moscow Oblispolkom and the Moscow and Leningrad Gorispolkoms are to report the indicated changes to Gosplan RSFSR and the RSFSR State Committee for Statistics no later than 10 days before the end of the month.

Chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers V. Vorotnikov

Administrator of Affairs of the RSFSR Council of Ministers I. Zarubin

Moscow, 24 December 1987, No 505

Official Views Development of Services Sphere

PM210825 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with I. Prostyakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development, by O. Osipov: "At Your Service"; date and place not given]

[Text] Our conversation with I. Prostyakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development, began with the question: Is the state losing a great deal from the backwardness of the service sphere?

[Prostyakov] According to certain data, the population pays private individuals approximately R1.5 billion annually for consumer services alone. Moreover, private operators—I do not, of course, mean people engaged in individual labor activity—far outstrip the state system in terms of a number of services. Thus in 1986 "moonlighters" earned 1.8 times more for repairs and construction work than consumer service enterprises in this sphere.

I could cite many such examples. The population loses out and so does the state. It is simply difficult to measure the real size of these losses. The draft resolution has set specific targets for individual sectors in the service sphere. The restructuring of services should be bolstered as far as possible by material resources. In particular, machine builders have been given targets and timetables within which they must assimilate the production of certain types of equipment and organize its series production.

[Osipov] It is probably appropriate to mention here the Comprehensive Program for the Development of Consumer Goods Production and the Services Sphere in 1986-2000. It also seemed to formulate everything necessary to get our services moving. However, it has not had any marked effect yet. The volume of paid services remains small and people engaged in providing services are not interested in the customer...

[Prostyakov] First, it is proposed to bring about an additional considerable increase in the volume of services by comparison with the Comprehensive Program—I will say just how a little later.

Second, the comprehensive program had one substantial shortcoming. It made no changes to the economic mechanism. Therefore the system of strong-arm pressure continued to operate. The new resolution outlines, apart from volume indicators, a restructuring of the management system in the service sphere based on the principles of the economic interest of people engaged in providing services and enterprises' economic independence and self-financing.

It is proposed—and this is of fundamental importance—to extend the scope of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) to all sectors of the sphere of paid services for the population. That is, an economic mechanism whereby it will be to the advantage of service workers to boost labor productivity and improve quality will be brought into operation.

Collectives' rights to use the wages fund and recruit additional personnel are being broadened. In effect all restrictions are being removed here. It is recommended that the contract form of labor organization—whereby foremen give enterprises a fixed amount of the proceeds and the rest goes on wages according to each man's contribution—be widely employed. This will have a great effect. For instance, contract service workers in Estonian SSR consumer service enterprises earn 36

percent more than the sectorial average. At the same time costs have been cut, the quality of the services has improved, and virtually all complaints have disappeared.

Collectives are being given the right to set contract, temporary prices, especially for new types of services. Local soviets will be able to establish seasonal price markups or discounts. This is necessary, say, to even out demand for dry cleaning services—today, for example, the massive deposit of school uniforms shortly before 1 September is literally a natural disaster.

Now a word about service volumes. I will be blunt and say that if we gamble only on specialized enterprises the situation will scarcely improve in the foreseeable future. We simply do not have enough money to subsidize their rapid growth—the service sphere's capital-intensiveness is, by the way, 1.7 times higher than that of consumer goods production. Therefore it has been decided to enlist enterprises from various ministries and departments to offer paid services.

[Osipov] But enterprises were also sent plans for services before, which more often than not caused the collective nothing but expense. It is no secret that many allocated some of the wages fund to fulfill such targets and sometimes offered services to the detriment of their main production. Won't they be out of pocket now as well?

[Prostyakov] No, because paid services can be organized so that they do not appear as a minus in the wages fund but as a weighty plus. Any enterprise is being granted the right to offer the population any services not prohibited by legislation. Even, moreover, in basic worktime.

Why, say, can't motorized transport units repair private automobiles? A profitable business! Why not recondition vehicles which have reached the end of their service lifetime—and, incidentally, it has been decided to accelerate the writing off of vehicles—and use them to provide the population with services. What about creating a cooperative to look after the condition of transport? In short, many possibilities are opening up.

[Osipov] What if some machine building plant wants, for example, to open a hairdresser's or a dry cleaner's—where will it be able to obtain the necessary equipment?

[Prostyakov] This is the most sensitive issue. The draft resolution plans to extend production of technological equipment for the consumer service sphere. However, of course, it will take some time to get up to speed in this area.

There are plans to reorganize the material and technical supply system. There are plans to switch from distribution according to quotas and allocations to wholesale trade.

I would like to stress something else: We are creating favorable conditions for the work of enterprises and cooperatives in the service sphere, and the basic principle is not administrative pressure but economic interest. The process of organizing cooperatives will clearly be stepped up with the adoption of the Law on the Cooperatives in the USSR. At present nearly 100 cooperatives are registering each month in Moscow. Consequently, the competition factor—a good incentive for improving the quality of services—must make an increasingly great impact.

Agricultural

Media Report 19-23 Apr Agricultural Developments

LD232354 [Editorial report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 19-23 April. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

19 April

In Tajikistan farmers have completed sowing of fine-fiber varieties of cotton. To date cottonseed has been planted on an area of about 250,000 hectares, almost 80 percent of the area allocated for cotton. Mineral fertilizers and herbicides are being put on the soil at the same time as seed. (0204)

20 April

Cotton sowing has been completed in Tashkent Oblast. (0204)

Sunflower sowing is underway in the North Ossetiyan ASSR. (0204)

21 April

In Uzbekistan rice has been planted on the first thousands of hectares at specialized farms in Surkhan-Darya Oblast. This season almost 150,000 hectares have been allocated for rice growing in the republic. (0204)

The sowing of early spring crops has been completed in Rostov Oblast. Crops are coming up on the 1.65 million hectares sown with winter crops. (1800)

22 April

In the North Ossetiyan ASSR corn sowing has begun. Frequent rains are hampering the work. (0000)

In Georgia soya sowing has been completed in the west of the republic. This spring the acreage planted with the crop has exceeded 40,000 hectares. (0000)

To date early spring grain crops and pulse and grass crop mixtures have been planted on 300,000 hectares at farms of Tambov Oblast's agro-industrial complex—more than a third of the plan. The entire grain acreage in the oblast, 2.2 million hectares, is being tilled on a contract basis. (0204)

23 April

In Uzbekistan more than 30 rayons of the republic have completed sowing of cotton. In the republic as a whole an area exceeding 1.7 million hectares has been sown with cotton, which is much more than last year.

Farms in the southern rayons of Kirghizia have begun harvesting winter rape. This feed crop is delivered to livestock units direct from the fields. The sowing of corn is being carried out on the harvested areas. (0700)

Sowing has begun in the non-Chernozem Zone of the Mari ASSR, where it is planned to grow spring crops on more than 300,000 hectares. (1300)

Scientific

'Spetsatom' To Handle Nuclear Emergencies

LD251133 Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT 25 Apr 88

[Text] Pripyat, Kiev Region April 25 TASS—A major new organization has been set up in the Soviet Union to deal with technical snags, malfunctions and emergencies at nuclear power projects.

Called Spetsatom, it will also develop and test robots and remote-controlled machines to do various jobs in zones with higher-than-normal radiation levels.

Mars Probes To Be Launched 7, 12 July

LD231216 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 23 Apr 88

[Text] Two Soviet probes are to be launched toward Mars and its satellite Phobos, one on July 7th and the other on July 12th. Equipped with the latest gains of world science and engineering, the probes are to overcome [as heard] almost 500 million km. The flight will last for about 200 days. Apart from Soviet researchers, specialists from many other countries and from the European Space Agency have taken part in working out and implementing the Phobos Project. The probes will explore Mars at a distance of several dozen meters and relay the planet's image to earth. Subsequently they will explore Phobos with the help of laser.

Experiments Aboard 'Mir' Station Described

LD250850 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 25 Apr 88

[Excerpts] Our editorial office receives many letters in which you ask us to speak in more detail about the cosmonauts' practical work in orbit. Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov have been working for more than 4 months in the Mir complex. Last week, they carried out a series of interesting experiments involving unique space technology. Our correspondent, Leonid Lazarevich, will speak now about this work.

[Lazarevich] Technological experiments yield great practical results. The cosmonauts obtain in orbit semiconductor materials that are impossible to obtain on earth. The thing is that those alloys consist of components that do not mix on earth, as is the case, say, of water and oil. This new technology should be perfected, and this is precisely what the crew has been doing. Here is what Titov and Manarov told me during a communication session:

[Begin recording] [First unidentified male speaker] A series of technological experiments is now under way. Four samples are ready to be sent back, and another experiment is being carried out. Specialists say that the samples received from space and tested—they have already obtained results—are exactly what they need, though difficult to obtain on earth. Of course, it is great to be able to help.

[Lazarevich] The installation that you are using is semi-industrial, judging by its name. You are working on the Korund, are you not?

[First male speaker] Yes.

[Lazarevich] This shows that what you are doing is not mere laboratory research but an approach to the industrial use of space.

[Second unidentified male speaker] Certain tasks do not require a large number of materials. It is enough to obtain several kilograms, or even grams, of a substance, and they may be of great practical use on earth. Such materials include certain semiconductor materials, as well as biological materials that will make it possible to develop new, pure vaccines, etc. Therefore, even a small orbital station can serve great functions. [passage omitted] [end recording]

[Lazarevich] For the time being, the cosmonauts are perfecting the technology. As you know, however, last week a specialized technological satellite was placed in orbit. The instruments and equipment used in it had been developed on the basis of data obtained by space crews.

East-West To Cooperate in Atomic Energy

LD230146 Moscow TASS in English 2113 GMT 22 Apr 88

[Text] Vienna April 22 TASS—TASS correspondent Viktor Tumanov reports:

The first session of the ITER Council which is a working body of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) project has been held at the headquarters of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). It was attended by representatives of the USSR, the U.S., Japan and member countries of the European Association for Atomic Energy (Euratom).

The session approved a plan of activities aimed at working out a concept and technical characteristics of a future reactor. It was decided to start work at the Euratom Centre of Thermonuclear Studies in Garching, West Germany.

Assessing the results of the session, Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences and head of a Soviet delegation, said in a TASS interview that the beginning of the work at the ITER project was a practical result of the initiative put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at his summit meetings in 1985 with President Mitterrand of France in Paris and U.S. President Reagan in Geneva. For the first time ever, scientists passed over from the exchange of information on theoretical studies to practical steps in the mastering of controlled thermonuclear synthesis. The ITER project, which is actually the first joint international scientific venture, became possible because of the improvement of the international situation. It will permit to get closer to the creation of a safe and inexhaustible source of energy, will promote the consolidation of cooperation of scientists, and will serve as a bridge for mutual understanding between the East and the West.

New Computer Based on 'YeS-1068' Completed

LD250927 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0605 GMT 25 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 25 Apr (TASS)—A new Soviet computer complex based on the YeS-1068 computer is capable of efficiently accomplishing such complex tasks as geological prospecting for major mineral deposits and constructing models of ecological processes.

Tests that have now been completed have shown the high productivity of the complex: 600 million operations per second. Such high productivity was achieved by supplementing the serial computer YeS-1068 with special matrix processors designed to accomplish specific tasks. Although the actual method of building such a structure is well known around the world, no such finished industrial complexes exist abroad as yet.

Briefs

Space Signal Received

A radio optical telescope with a mirror antenna of 54 meters in diameter, recently constructed at Mount Aragats in Armenia, has received first signals from space. During its test the telescope has registered a rare phenomenon: a powerful flare at one of the stars in the Gemini Constellation. It took 250 years for the radio signal to travel from there to the earth. [Text] [*LD242256 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 24 Apr 88*]

Military

Lizichev Delivers Cultural Enlightenment Report

PM250913 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Apr 88 Second Edition p 2

[Report by unnamed TASS correspondent: "Profession—Army Cultural Worker"]

[Text] Lvov, 16 Apr—The recommendations of the Scientific-Practical Conference of USSR Armed Forces Cultural Enlightenment Workers that ended today in Lvov will be of practical assistance to working people in army cultural institutions. It was held over a 4-day period at units of the Red Banner Carpathian Military District and at the Lvov Higher Military Political Academy—the only educational establishment in the country training military cultural worker cadres.

The report by Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and speeches by representatives of the USSR Ministry of Culture, the sector trade union Central Committee, the All-Union Scientific-Methodological Center for People's Creative Work, and others paid special attention to questions of restructuring work in light of the demands of the 27th party congress and CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum. It was noted that most members of the aktivs of officers' clubs, centers, and libraries and other institutions are striving to make them centers of attraction. Interesting forms of work are springing up there and events of a high ideological and political standard are being conducted.

At the same time, formalism and a reluctance on the part of certain specialists to look at life beyond the front door of the club have not yet been eradicated. They only talk about restructuring. These shortcomings are due to a lack of proper attention to cultural enlightenment work on the part of party and Komsomol organizations.

The conference participants were familiarized with the work experience of the best cultural institutions in the Red Banner Carpathian Military District.

Report Details Draftees' Shortcomings
PM221115 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Apr 88 Second Edition p 3

["PRAVDA Military Department" report under the rubric "We Serve the Soviet Union!": "The Spring Draft"]

[Text] Once again the country's draft centers are crowded. Young reinforcements are being drafted into the Soviet Armed Forces to replace those who have served their time according to the law. Many teenagers have already managed not only to acquire basic knowledge of their future specialized military sphere but even to master it properly.

It will soon be 2 years since the day when the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution was adopted. Much has been done to fulfill it. Local party and soviet organs and ministries and departments are now giving more attention to young people in general and to their training for service in the Army and Navy in particular.

The USSR People's Control Committee recently carried out an inspection to find out how the Belorussian, Uzbek, Moldavian, and Latvian Union Republics, the Udmurt ASSR, four RSFSR oblasts, and several of Moscow's rayons are fulfilling the party and government demands regarding young people's training for active military service.

In this context, we were told at the USSR People's Control Committee that the experience of the Belorussian SSR deserves attention. Tasks concerning young people's military training, physical education, and ideological tempering are being solved in a comprehensive fashion there.

At the same time, young citizens' preparation for military service is not everywhere fully in line with the provisions of the USSR Law "On Universal Military Service Obligation" and the party and government demands. The current draft in particular offers specific confirmation of this in a number of places.

People's Control Committee representatives visited 47 military units in several military districts and fleets. It was established that some young soldiers had only a vague idea of the basics of military service and were not familiar with the basic demands of the military oath and regulations. This applies in particular to draftees from Central Asian and Transcaucasian republics.

The reasons behind these and other shortcomings? The poor standard of instruction in initial military training, inadequate and at times altogether nonexistent instruction-material base, and the formal attitude toward this important work sector on the part of responsible officials. It is no secret that military training in many schools, technical colleges, and vocational and technical schools is still considered a subject of secondary importance. There are schools where it is either altogether absent or is assigned to incompetent persons.

More than one-half of military instructors have no military education. More than one-half of military instructors in the Turkmen SSR and the Udmurt ASSR have seen no army service. One military instructor in 10, and one in every three in Moscow, is over 60 years old.

The same old shortcoming—inadequate physical training of many teenagers—is to be noticed at draft centers also this year. Yet almost all draftees are classed as qualified for the "Ready for Labor and Defense" badge, with some even classed as officially rated sportsmen. The People's Control Committee inspection revealed grossly exaggerated reports in this context. Not more than 10-15 percent of teenagers in some rayons of Moldavia, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan proved up to the "Ready for Labor and Defense" standards. How is physical tempering to be achieved if instructions on the creation and improvement of the physical training base are not fulfilled everywhere at the local level? Such a base exists only in one-half of educational establishments in the country, while the percentage is lower still in Uzbekistan, Latvia, and Moscow.

The quality of specialist training remains poor. For example, one-half of students at rural vocational and technical schools and some DOSAAF schools in Turkmenistan, the Udmurt SSR, and Tomsk Oblast have had to retake their driver's permit tests. Similar shortcomings also exist in the training of electricians and radiotelegraph operators.

There are many omissions in educational work among young people of draft age. As a result the number of breaches of the law committed by draftees is not declining in a number of regions.

On the whole, the results of the People's Control Committee inspection show that not all republic councils of ministers or ispolkoms make full use of the rights vested in them regarding monitoring and coordinating the activity of local organs and organizations responsible for the education and training of future servicemen.

Responsible organs at both central and local level must once more exactingly check their activity in training young people for military service against the demands of party and government resolutions.

...The spring draft is under way. Teenagers are joining the ranks of our motherland's defenders. It is very important that they should report at draft centers comprehensively trained for service.